arXiv:1507.05080v1 [math.NT] 17 Jul 2015

PRIMES REPRESENTED BY INCOMPLETE NORM FORMS

JAMES MAYNARD

Abstract. Let $K = \mathbb{Q}(\omega)$ with ω the root of a degree n monic irreducible polynomial $f \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$. We show the degree n polynomial $N(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} x_i\omega^{i-1})$ in $n-k$ variables takes the expected asymptotic number of prime values if $n \geq 4k$. In the special case $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt[n]{\theta})$, we show $N(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} x_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})$ takes infinitely many prime values provided $n \geq 22k/7$.

Our proof relies on using suitable 'Type I' and 'Type II' estimates in Harman's sieve, which are established in a similar overall manner to the previous work of Friedlander and Iwaniec on prime values of $X^2 + Y^4$ and of Heath-Brown on $X^3 + 2Y^3$. Our proof ultimately relies on employing explicit elementary estimates from the geometry of numbers and algebraic geometry to control the number of highly skewed lattices appearing in our final estimates.

1. Introduction

It is believed any integer polynomial satisfying some simple necessary conditions should represent infinitely many primes. Specifically, we have the following.

Conjecture. *Let $f \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ be an irreducible polynomial of degree d with positive leading coefficient and no fixed prime divisor. Then we have*

$$\#\{1 \leq a \leq x : f(a) \text{ prime}\} = \mathfrak{S}_f \frac{x}{d\log x} + o_f\Big(\frac{x}{\log x}\Big),$$

where

$$\mathfrak{S}_f = \prod_p \Big(1 - \frac{\nu_f(p)}{p}\Big)\Big(1 - \frac{1}{p}\Big)^{-1}, \quad \nu_f(p) = \#\{1 \leq a \leq p : f(a) \equiv 0 \pmod p\}.$$

It follows from the Chebotarev density theorem that the infinite product $\mathfrak{S}_f$ converges (conditionally) to a positive constant.

Unfortunately no case of the above conjecture is known other than when f is linear, and the problem seems to be well beyond current techniques. A non-linear polynomial f represents $O(x^{1/2})$ integers less than x, and there are essentially no examples of sets containing $O(x^{1/2})$ integers less than x which contain infinitely many primes (beyond artificial examples)[1]. Thus the sparsity of the set of values of f presents a major obstacle.

As an approximation to the conjecture one can look at polynomials $f \in \mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ in multiple variables, so the resulting sets are less sparse. If the number of variables is sufficiently large (relative to other measures of the complexity of f) then

[1]The seemingly simpler problem of showing the existence of a prime in the short interval $[x, x + x^{1/2}]$, for example, is not known even under the assumption of the Riemann hypothesis.

in principle the Hardy-Littlewood circle method can be used to show that every *integer* satisfying necessary local conditions is represented by f. It follows from the seminal work of Birch [1], for example, that any homogeneous non-singular $f \in \mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ of degree d with no fixed prime divisor represents infinitely many prime values provided $n > (d-1)2^d$.

When the number of variables is not larger than the degree only a few polynomials are known to represent infinitely many primes, and these tend to have extra algebraic structure. Iwaniec [15] shows that any suitable quadratic polynomial represents infinitely many primes. If $K/\mathbb{Q}$ is a number field with a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis $\{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}$ of $\mathcal{O}_K$, then the norm form $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(X_1\beta_1 + \cdots + X_n\beta_n) \in \mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ is a degree n polynomial in n variables which represents infinitely many primes, since every degree 1 principal prime ideal of K gives rise to a prime value of $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}$.

The groundbreaking work of Friedlander–Iwaniec [6] shows that the polynomial $X_1^2 + X_2^4$ takes the expected number of prime values. Along with the work of Heath-Brown [12] on $X_1^3 + 2X_2^3$ (and its generalizations due Heath-Brown and Moroz [14], [13]), these are the only known examples of a set of polynomial values containing $O(x^c)$ elements less than x (for some constant $c < 1$) which contain infinitely many prime values. A key feature in the proofs are the fact these polynomials are closely related to norm forms; $N_{\mathbb{Q}(i)/\mathbb{Q}}(X_1 + X_2^2 i) = X_1^2 + X_2^4$ and $N_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt[3]{2})/\mathbb{Q}}(X_1 + X_2\sqrt[3]{2}) = X_1^3 + 2X_2^3$. This allows structure of the prime factorization in the number field to be combined with bilinear techniques to count primes in these cases.

Our result is to give further examples of thin polynomials which represent infinitely many primes.

Theorem 1.1. *Let n, k be positive integers. Let $f \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ be a monic irreducible polynomial of degree n with root $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$. Let $K = \mathbb{Q}(\omega)$ be the corresponding number field of degree n, and let $N_K \in \mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_{n-k}]$ be the 'incomplete norm form'*

$$N_K(\mathbf{a}) = N_K(a_1, \dots, a_{n-k}) = N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} a_i \omega^{i-1}\Big).$$

If $n \geq 4k$ then as $X \to \infty$ we have

$$\#\{\mathbf{a} \in [1, X]^{n-k} : N_K(\mathbf{a}) \text{ prime}\} = (\mathfrak{S} + o(1)) \int_{\substack{\mathbf{t} \in [1,X]^{n-k} \\ N_K(\mathbf{t}) \geq 2}} \cdots \int \frac{dt_1 \dots dt_{n-k}}{\log N_K(\mathbf{t})},$$

where

$$\mathfrak{S} = \prod_p \Big(1 - \frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big)\Big(1 - \frac{1}{p}\Big)^{-1},$$
$$\nu(p) = \#\{1 \leq a_1, \dots, a_{n-k} \leq p : N_K(\mathbf{a}) \equiv 0 \pmod p\}.$$

All implied constants depend only on ω and are effectively computable.

Theorem 1.2. *Let n, k be positive integers. Let $f(X) = X^n - \theta \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ be irreducible, $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt[n]{\theta})$ and $N_K(\mathbf{a}) = N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} a_i \sqrt[n]{\theta}^{i-1})$, as in Theorem 1.1 in the case $f(X) = X^n - \theta$.*

If $n \geq 22k/7$ and X is sufficiently large then

$$\#\{\mathbf{a} \in [1,X]^{n-k} : N_K(\mathbf{a}) \text{ prime}\} \gg \mathfrak{S} \int_{\substack{\mathbf{t}\in[1,X]^{n-k} \\ N_K(\mathbf{t})\geq 2}} \cdots \int \frac{dt_1 \dots dt_{n-k}}{\log N_K(\mathbf{t})} \gg \frac{X^{n-k}}{\log X}.$$

All implied constants depend only on θ and are effectively computable.

A sieve upper bound shows $\#\{\mathbf{a} \in [1,X]^{n-k} : N_K(\mathbf{a}) \text{ prime}\} \ll \mathfrak{S}X^{n-k}/\log X$, and so the lower bound in Theorem 1.2 is of the correct order of magnitude. We note $22/7 = 3.14\ldots < 4$.

Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 give examples of sets of polynomial values containing roughly $x^{1-k/n}$ elements less than x which contain many primes. We obtain an asymptotic for the number of primes in the sets of Theorem 1.1 which contain $\gg x^{3/4}$ values less than x, and a lower bound of the correct order of magnitude for the sets of Theorem 1.2 which contain $\gg x^{7/22}$ elements. By way of comparison, the Friedlander–Iwaniec polynomial $X_1^2 + X_2^4$ takes roughly $x^{3/4}$ values less than x, which is at the limit of the range for asymptotic estimates in Theorem 1.1, whilst Heath-Brown's polynomial $X_1^3 + 2X_2^3$ takes roughly $x^{2/3}$ values less than x, which is thinner than the sets considered in Theorem 1.1 or Theorem 1.2.

By virtue of being homogeneous, the algebraic structure of the polynomials considered in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 are simpler in some key aspects to the Friedlander–Iwaniec polynomial $X_1^2 + X_2^4$; much of the paper [6] is spent employing sophisticated techniques to handle sums twisted by a quadratic character caused by the non-homogeneity. In our situation the key multiplicative machinery is instead just a Siegel-Walfisz type estimate for Hecke L-functions. (The fact that $n > 3k$ means that characters of large conductor do not play a role, and so we don't even require a large sieve type estimate as in [12].) On the other hand, the fact that we consider polynomials in an arbitrary number of variables and with multiple coordinates of the norm form set to 0 introduces different geometric complications. It is handling such issues which is this key innovation of this paper.

Unlike the previous estimates, the implied constants in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 are effectively computable. This is a by-product of the fact we explicitly treat the contribution of a possible exceptional quadratic character in order to be able to utilize a Siegel-Walfisz type estimate in a slightly wider range of uniformity of conductor. This extra range of uniformity enables us to restrict ourselves to simpler algebraic estimates.

In view of the results of Friedlander–Iwaniec and Heath-Brown, the restrictions of $n \geq 4k$ and $n \geq 22k/7$ in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 might seem unnatural at first sight, but it turns out that these are natural barriers to any simple argument used to establish 'Type I' and 'Type II' estimates. If one simply bounds the naturally occuring error terms by their absolute values without showing genuine cancellations, then one can only hope to obtain 'Type I' and 'Type II' estimates in certain restricted ranges depending on the density of the sequence. Heath-Brown [12] obtains an asymptotic in a sparser sequence precisely because he is able to treat the error terms arising in a non-trivial manner. We discuss this further in Section 9.

With more care one could improve the asymptotic in Theorem 1.1 to give a quantitative bound to the $o(1)$ appearing.

2. Outline of the proof

In the interest of clarity, we prove Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 together in the case of $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt[n]{\theta})$ in Sections 4-9, and then in Section 10 we sketch the few modifications to the argument required to obtain Theorem 1.1 in the general case of $K = \mathbb{Q}(\omega)$.

We now give a broad outline of the key steps in the proof; what we say here should be thought of as a heuristic motivation and not interpreted precisely.

Given a small quantity $\eta_1 > 0$, we let

$$\mathscr{A} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-k} : x_i \in [X_i, X_i + \eta_1 X_i]\},$$

and we establish a suitable estimate for the number of times $N_K(\mathbf{x})$ is prime for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathscr{A}$ for each of these smaller sets individually. For each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathscr{A}$, there is a principal ideal $(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} x_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})$ with the same norm, and for η_1 sufficiently small this ideal is unique. Thus we wish to count the number degree 1 prime ideals in $\mathfrak{A} = \{(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} x_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathscr{A}\}$, and so can use the unique factorization of ideals in K.

In Section 5 we apply a combinatorial decomposition to $\mathfrak{A}$ based on Buchstab's identity and Harman's sieve [10]. In the case when $n > 4k$ this takes the simple form

$$\begin{aligned}\#\{\text{prime ideals in } \mathfrak{A}\} = \#\{\text{ideals in } \mathfrak{A} \text{ with no prime factor of norm} < X^{n-3k-\epsilon}\}\\ - \sum_{X^{n-3k-\epsilon} < N(\mathfrak{p}) < X^{n/2+\epsilon}} \#\{\text{ideals in } \mathfrak{A} \text{ with } \mathfrak{p} \text{ the factor of smallest norm }\}\end{aligned}$$

The point of this decomposition is that we will be able to appropriately estimate terms when every ideal counted has a factor whose norm is in the interval $[X^{k+\epsilon}, X^{n-2k-\epsilon}]$. This is clearly the case with the second term on the right hand side above. The first term can be repeatedly decomposed by further Buchstab iterations so that all terms count ideals with a prime factor of norm in the interval $[R, RX^{n-3k-2\epsilon}]$ (for any suitable choice of R), or simply count the number of ideals in $\mathscr{A}$ which are a multiple of some divisor $\mathfrak{d}$.

Thus it suffices to obtain suitable asymptotic estimates (at least on average) for the number of ideals in $\mathfrak{A}$ which are a multiple of some ideal $\mathfrak{d}$, or the number of ideals in $\mathfrak{A}$ with a particular type of prime factorization whenever this prime factorization ensures the existence of a conveniently sized factor. These estimates are the so-called 'Type I' (linear) and 'Type II' (bilinear) estimates which provide the key arithmetic content.

Our Type I estimate of Section 6 states that

$$\sum_{N(\mathfrak{d}) \in [D, 2D]} \left| \#\{\mathfrak{a} \in \mathfrak{A} : \mathfrak{d} | \mathfrak{a}\} - \frac{\rho(\mathfrak{d}) \#\mathfrak{A}}{N(\mathfrak{d})} \right| \ll X^{n-k-1} D^{1/(n-k)+\epsilon} + D,$$

where ρ is the function defined by

$$\rho(\mathfrak{d}) = \frac{\#\{\mathbf{x} \in [1, N(\mathfrak{d})]^{n-k} : \mathfrak{d} | (\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} x_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})\}}{N(\mathfrak{d})^{n-k-1}}.$$

This allows us to accurately count the number of ideals in $\mathfrak{A}$ which are a multiple of an ideal of norm $O(X^{n-k-\epsilon})$ on average. Since $\#\mathfrak{A} \approx X^{n-k}$, we see that this range is essentially best possible.

If $\mathfrak{d} = (\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})$ is a principal ideal in $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]$, then we see that the number of ideals $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{e}\mathfrak{d}$ in $\mathfrak{A}$ which are a multiple of $\mathfrak{d}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}&\#\{\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} e_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}} \times \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}} \in \mathscr{A}\}\\ &= \{\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \mathbf{d}^{(i)} \cdot \mathbf{e} \in [X_i, X_i + \eta_1 X_i] \text{ for } i \leq n-k, \mathbf{d}^{(i)} \cdot \mathbf{e} = 0 \text{ for } i > n-k\}\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{d}^{(i)}$ is the i^{th} vector in the multiplication-by-$\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ matrix with respect to the basis $\{\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$. But this is counting vectors in the lattice defined by $\mathbf{d}^{(i)} \cdot \mathbf{e} = 0$ for $i > n-k$ in the bounded region defined by $\mathbf{d}^{(i)} \cdot \mathbf{e} \in [X_i, X_i + \eta_1 X_i]$ for $i \leq n-k$. By estimates from the geometry of numbers, the number of such points is the volume of the bounded region divided by the lattice discriminant, provided the lattice and the bounded region are not too skewed. Our Type I estimate then follows from showing that the number of skewed lattices is rare. (Small technical modifications are made to deal with $\mathfrak{d}$ in other ideal classes.)

The argument then relies on establishing a suitable Type II estimate, which is the main part of the paper. Given integers $\ell_2 \leq \ell$ and a polytope $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^\ell$ such that any $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{R}$ has $e_i \geq \epsilon^2$ for all i and $k + \epsilon < \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i < n - 2k - \epsilon$, our Type II estimate obtains an asymptotic for the sum

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{a} \in \mathfrak{A}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{a})$$

where

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{a}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{p}_1 \dots \mathfrak{p}_\ell,\ N(\mathfrak{p}_i) = X^{e_i},\ (e_1, \dots, e_\ell) \in \mathcal{R}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This sum counts ideals in $\mathfrak{A}$ with a given number of prime factors each of a given size, and the condition that $k + \epsilon < \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i < n - 2k - \epsilon$ implies that $\mathfrak{a}$ has a 'conveniently sized' ideal factor. By performing a decomposition to $\mathcal{R}$ we may assume that $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_1 \times \mathcal{R}_2$ for two polytopes $\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2$ with $\mathcal{R}_2$ corresponding to the conveniently sized factor. We are left to estimate the bilinear sum

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b} \in \mathfrak{A}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}).$$

We estimate this sum using a combination of L^1 and L^2 bounds. We introduce an approximation $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})$ to $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})$, which is a sieve weight designed to have the same distributional properties as $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})$. The sums $\sum_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b} \in \mathfrak{A}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a}) \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})$ can then be estimated using our Type I estimates, and give the expected asymptotic.

To show the error in this approximation is small we use Linnik's dispersion method to exploit the bilinear structure. By Cauchy-Schwarz and using $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq 1$, we are

left to bound

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{a}}\Big|\sum_{\mathfrak{b}:\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}\in\mathfrak{A}}\Big(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})-\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})\Big)\Big|^2.$$

Writing $g_{\mathfrak{b}}=\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})-\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})$, expanding the square and swapping the order of summation we are left to estimate

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{b}_1,\mathfrak{b}_2}g_{\mathfrak{b}_1}g_{\mathfrak{b}_2}\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a}\\ \mathfrak{b}_1\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}_2\mathfrak{a}\in\mathfrak{A}}}1.$$

If $\mathfrak{b}_1,\mathfrak{b}_2$ are both principal and $\mathfrak{a}=(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})$ for some $\mathbf{a}=(a_1,\dots,a_n)\in\mathbb{Z}^n$ then each condition $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}_1\in\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}_2\in\mathfrak{A}$ imposes k linear constraints on $\mathbf{a}$ (with coefficients of these linear constraints depending on the coefficients of the $\mathfrak{b}_i$). For generic $\mathfrak{b}_1,\mathfrak{b}_2$ these constraints are linearly independent, and so $\mathbf{a}$ will be constrained to lie in a bounded region in a rank $n-2k$ lattice. Using the geometry of numbers again, the number of such $\mathbf{a}$ is roughly the volume of the region divided by the lattice discriminant, provided neither are too skewed. An iterative argument shows that the number of skewed lattices here is acceptably small.

To finish the estimate we have to show suitable cancellation in the sum

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{b}_1,\mathfrak{b}_2}\frac{g_{\mathfrak{b}_1}g_{\mathfrak{b}_2}\operatorname{vol}(\mathscr{R}_{\mathfrak{b}_1,\mathfrak{b}_2})}{\det(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}_1,\mathfrak{b}_2})},$$

where $\mathscr{R}_{\mathfrak{b}_1,\mathfrak{b}_2}$ and $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}_1,\mathfrak{b}_2}$ are the bounded region and lattice which $\mathbf{a}$ was constrained to. The volume of the bounded region is continuous, and so plays a minor role. More significant complications occur in showing that those $\mathfrak{b}_1,\mathfrak{b}_2$ for which $\det(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}_1,\mathfrak{b}_2})$ is small make a negligible contribution.

The determinant can be small if a certain vector of polynomials in the coefficients of $\mathfrak{b}_1,\mathfrak{b}_2$ is small in either the Euclidean metric or a p-adic metric. To show this is only rarely the case we obtain a (sharp) bound on the dimension of the corresponding variety given by these polynomials. We obtain this by elementary algebraic means by exploiting the simple explicit description of multiplication of elements in the order $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]$.

Having shown that only those $\mathfrak{b}_1,\mathfrak{b}_2$ for which $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{b}_1,\mathfrak{b}_2}$ has determinant almost as large as possible make a contribution, we can localize the coefficients of $\mathfrak{b}_1,\mathfrak{b}_2$ to a small region in the Euclidean metric and p-adic metrics for small p. Once localized in this way, the denominator no longer plays an important role. The remaining sum then factors, so we are ultimately left to show cancellation in

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{b}}{}'g_{\mathfrak{b}}$$

where $\sum'$ indicates the coefficients are localized to a small box and an arithmetic progression. Recalling that $g_{\mathfrak{b}}=\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{b})-\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})$, we can show such an estimate using a Siegel-Walfisz type bound for Hecke Grossencharacters. In avoiding some algebraic considerations, we require uniformity in the conductor to be slightly larger than a fixed power of a logarithm in the norm of the ideals considered, and this requires us to take explicit account of possible fluctuations caused by a Siegel zero throughout the argument.

3. Notation

We view n, k, θ and $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt[n]{\theta})$ (or $K = \mathbb{Q}(\omega)$ in Section 10) as fixed throughout the paper, and all constants implied by $O(\cdot)$, $o(\cdot)$, $\ll$ and $\gg$ may depend on these. All asymptotic notation should be interpreted in the limit as $X \to \infty$.

Throughout the paper we let ϵ be an arbitrarily small but fixed (i.e. independent of X) positive constant which is always assumed to be sufficiently small in terms of n and k. Our implied constants will not depend on ϵ unless explicitly stated, but we will assume $\epsilon \geq \log\log X$ to avoid too many dependencies in our error terms. We let Δ_K be the discriminant of the field K, $\phi_K(\mathfrak{a}) = N(\mathfrak{a})\prod_{\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{a}}(1 - N(\mathfrak{p})^{-1})$, and γ_K the residue of $\zeta_K(s)$ at $s = 1$.

By abuse of notation we write $N = N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}$ for the norm form on ideals of K, and for algebraic integers of K. We let $N_K(\mathbf{x})$ be the polynomial in $n-k$ variables $x_1, \dots, x_{n-k}$ which coincides with $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} x_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})$ on integers.

We use lower gothic script (e.g. $\mathfrak{a}$, $\mathfrak{b}$, ...) to denote integral ideals of K, and $\mathfrak{p}$ to denote a prime ideal of K. Algebraic integers in $\mathcal{O}_K$ will typically be written in greek lower case (e.g. $\alpha, \beta, \dots$) and (α) is used to denote the principal ideal generated by α. Vectors will be denoted by roman bold lower case (e.g. $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \dots$) and we have endeavored to use consistent notation across vectors, integers and ideals referring to related objects so that $\mathfrak{b} = (\beta)$ for an the principal ideal generated by $\beta = \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ for some vector $\mathbf{b}$. We let $\|\mathbf{b}\| = \sqrt{\sum_i b_i^2}$ denote the usual Euclidean norm.

We make several references to standard facts from algebraic number theory and the geometry of numbers and the prime ideal theorem without explicit reference. All such details are included, for example, in [7], [16] or [2].

4. Initial Manipulations

We begin our first steps in the proof of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 for $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt[n]{\theta})$. We may assume without loss of generality that θ is a positive integer if n is odd.

We wish to show that if $n \geq 4k$ we have

$$\#\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-k} : 1 \leq x_i \leq X,\, N_K(\mathbf{x}) \text{ prime}\} = \Big(\mathfrak{S} + O(\epsilon^{1/n})\Big) \int_{\substack{\mathbf{t}\in[1,X]^{n-k} \\ N_K(\mathbf{t})\geq 2}} \cdots \int \frac{dt_1 \dots dt_{n-k}}{\log N_K(\mathbf{t})},$$

and if $n \geq 22k/7$ then this is $\gg X^{n-k}/\log X$.

Let $\eta_1 = (\log X)^{-100}$. We tile the region $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-k} : 0 \leq x_i \leq X\}$ with $O(\eta_1^{-(n-k)})$ hypercubes of the form $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_i \in [X_i, X_i + \eta_1 X_i]\}$. By a simple sieve upper bound (see [8, Theorem 5.1], or Lemma 6.6 of Section 5), the number of primes values of $N(x_1, \dots, x_{n-k})$ for integer vectors $\mathbf{x}$ in such a hypercube is $O(\eta_1^{n-k} X^{n-k}/\log X)$. Thus the total number of prime values of N

from the $O(\eta_1^{-(n-k-1)})$ hypercubes not entirely contained within our original region $\{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^{n-k}:\ 0\le x_i\le X\}$ is $O(\eta_1 X^{n-k}/\log X)$. Similarly, we see the total contribution to the integral on the right hand side over real vectors $\mathbf{t}$ in the union of these hypercubes is $O(\eta_1 X^{n-k}/\log X)$. Both of these error terms are negligible, since the full integral is clearly $\gg X^{n-k}/\log X$.

We can clearly discard any hypercubes for which the norm is always negative. Since N has all derivatives of size $O(X^{n-1})$ on $[1,X]^{n-k}$, if $|N_K(\mathbf{x})|\le \epsilon X^n$ then all points $\mathbf{y}$ in the same hypercube as $\mathbf{x}$ satisfy $|N_K(\mathbf{x})|\le 2\epsilon X^n$. But there are $O(\epsilon^{1/n}X^n)$ integer points in $[1,X]^{n-k}$ for which $|N_K(\mathbf{x})|\le 2\epsilon X^n$ since given any choice of $x_2,\dots,x_{n-1}\le X$, x_1 must lie within $O(\epsilon^{1/n}X)$ of one of the (complex) roots of N, viewed as a polynomial in x_1. Thus there are $O(\epsilon^{1/n}\eta^{-(n-k)})$ hypercubes containing a point $\mathbf{x}$ with $|N_K(\mathbf{x})|\le \epsilon X^n$, and the total contribution from these hypercubes is $O(\epsilon^{1/n}X^{n-k}/\log X)$. Similarly, the contribution to the integral on the right hand side from $\mathbf{t}$ in the union of such hypercubes is $O(\epsilon^{1/n}X^{n-k}/\log X)$.

Let

$$\mathscr{A}=\#\{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{Z}^{n-k}: x_i\in[X_i,X_i+\eta_1X_i\}.$$

From the above argument, we see to establish Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 it suffices to show that for any fixed $\eta_1>0$ that when $n\ge 4k$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\#\{\mathbf{x}\in\mathscr{A}:\ N_K(\mathbf{x})\text{ prime}\}&=\Big(\mathfrak{S}+O(\epsilon^{1/n})\Big)\int\limits_{\substack{t_1,\dots,t_{n-k}\\ t_i\in[X_i,X_i+\eta_1X_i]}}\cdots\int\frac{dt_1\dots dt_{n-k}}{\log N_K(\mathbf{t})}\\&=\frac{(\mathfrak{S}+O(\epsilon^{1/n}))\#\mathscr{A}}{n\log X},\end{aligned}$$

and when $n\ge 22k/7$ we have

$$\#\{\mathbf{x}\in\mathscr{A}:\ N_K(\mathbf{x})\text{ prime}\}\gg\frac{\#\mathscr{A}}{\log X}.$$

Moreover, we require these estimates to be uniform over all $X_1,\dots,X_{n-k}\le X$ such that $N(X_1,\dots,X_{n-k})\gg\epsilon X^n$.

As mentioned in Section 2, due to later considerations of the effect of a possible Siegel zero we restrict $\mathscr{A}$ to a fixed residue class $\pmod{q^*}$, for some quantity $q^*\le\exp(\sqrt[4]{\log X})$ to be declared later. Given $\mathbf{a}_0\in\mathbb{Z}^{n-k}$ we define

$$\mathscr{A}'(\mathbf{a}_0)=\{\mathbf{x}\in\mathscr{A}:\mathbf{x}\equiv\mathbf{a}_0\pmod{q^*}\},$$

and we wish to obtain a final asymptotic for the number of prime values of N on $\mathscr{A}'(\mathbf{a}_0)$ on average over $\mathbf{a}_0\in[1,q^*]^{n-k}$. We see trivially there are no prime values whenever $N_K(\mathbf{a}_0)\equiv 0\pmod{q^*}$, so it suffices to consider $\mathbf{a}_0$ such that $\gcd(N_K(\mathbf{a}_0),q^*)=1$.

We now convert our problem to one of counting prime principle ideals, so we can make use of the unique factorization of ideals. We define

$$\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{a}_0)=\Big\{(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k}a_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}):\ \mathbf{a}\in\mathscr{A}'(\mathbf{a}_0)\Big\}$$

to be the set of principal ideals generated by elements of $\mathscr{A}$. We note that trivially there are $O(X^{n/2+\epsilon})$ prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ with $N(\mathfrak{p})\ll X^{n/2+\epsilon}$, and there are $O(X^{n/2})$

prime ideals with $N(\mathfrak{p})$ not prime and $N(\mathfrak{p}) \ll X^n$. Moreover, there are no two associates $\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} x_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} y_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ with $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathscr{A}$, so every ideal in $\mathcal{A}$ has a unique generator in $\mathscr{A}'(\mathbf{a}_0)$. Together these facts imply that

$$\#\Big\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathscr{A}'(\mathbf{a}_0) : N_K(\mathbf{x}) \text{ prime}\Big\} = \#\{\mathfrak{a} \in \mathcal{A} : \mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{a} \Rightarrow N(\mathfrak{p}) > X^{n/2+\epsilon}\} + O(X^{n/2+2\epsilon}).$$

Therefore it is enough to show, uniformly over all $\mathcal{A}$ under consideration, that if $n \geq 4k$ we have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a}_0 \in [1,q^*]^{n-k}} \#\{\mathfrak{a} \in \mathcal{A} : \mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{a} \Rightarrow N(\mathfrak{p}) > X^{n/2+\epsilon}\} = \Big(\mathfrak{S} + O(\epsilon^{1/n})\Big)\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{n \log X},$$

and if $n \geq 22k/7$ we have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a}_0 \in [1,q^*]^{n-k}} \#\{\mathfrak{a} \in \mathcal{A} : \mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{a} \Rightarrow N(\mathfrak{p}) > X^{n/2+\epsilon}\} \gg \frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}.$$

5. Sieve Decomposition

In this section we give a combinatorial decomposition of the number of primes in $\mathcal{A}$ based on Harman's sieve [10], and reduce our result to establishing a suitable Type I and Type II estimate.

It will be notationally convenient to fix a (slightly artificial) ordering of ideals in K for this section. We first fix an ordering of prime ideals of K such that $\mathfrak{p}_1 < \mathfrak{p}_2$ if $N(\mathfrak{p}_1) < N(\mathfrak{p}_2)$, and we choose an arbitrary ordering of prime ideals of the same norm. We extend this to an ordering of all ideals so that $\mathfrak{a} < \mathfrak{b}$ if $N(\mathfrak{a}) < N(\mathfrak{b})$ whilst if $N(\mathfrak{a}) = N(\mathfrak{b})$ we have $\mathfrak{a} < \mathfrak{b}$ if the least prime ideal factor of $\mathfrak{a}/\gcd(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ is less than the least prime ideal factor smaller of $\mathfrak{b}/\gcd(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$. Given a set of ideals $\mathcal{I}$ and an ideal $\mathfrak{a}$, we let

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathfrak{a}} = \{\mathfrak{b} : \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{I}\},$$
$$S(\mathcal{I}, \mathfrak{a}) = \#\{\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{I} : \mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{b} \Rightarrow \mathfrak{p} > \mathfrak{a}\}.$$

For convenience, we fix ideals $\mathfrak{z}_1, \mathfrak{z}_2$ chosen maximally with respect to this ordering such that $N(\mathfrak{z}_1) < X^{n-3k-2\epsilon}$ and $N(\mathfrak{z}_2) < X^{n/2+\epsilon}$. In particular, we see that

$$\#\{\mathfrak{a} \in \mathcal{A} : \mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{a} \Rightarrow N(\mathfrak{p}) > X^{n/2+\epsilon}\} = S(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{z}_2).$$

We now wish to decompose $S(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{z}_2)$ into various terms such that each term can either be estimated asymptotically, or the term is positive and can be dropped for a lower bound. Roughly speaking, we will be able to asymptotically estimate terms of the form $S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}}, \mathfrak{z}_1)$ when $N(\mathfrak{d}) < X^{n-k-\epsilon}$ and terms $S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}}, \mathfrak{z})$ for fairly arbitrary ideals $\mathfrak{z}$ if $X^{k+\epsilon} < N(\mathfrak{d}) < X^{n-2k-\epsilon}$ (this latter type we refer to as the 'Type II range').

When $n > 4k$ all terms in our decomposition can be evaluated asymptotically. Indeed the decomposition is essentially Vaughan's identity and our treatment is fundamentally the same as that of Heath-Brown [12] and Friedlander–Iwaniec [5], and with some minor modifications we could have simply used [5, Theorem 3]

to obtain our asymptotic formula. By Buchstab's identity (this simply applies inclusion-exclusion according to the smallest prime factor), we have

$$S(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{z}_2) = S(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{z}_1) - \sum_{\mathfrak{z}_1 < \mathfrak{p} \le \mathfrak{z}_2} S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}}, \mathfrak{p}).$$

For $n > 4k$, we have $N(\mathfrak{p}) \in [X^{n-3k-2\epsilon}, X^{n/2+\epsilon}] \subseteq [X^{k+\epsilon}, X^{n-2k-\epsilon}]$, and so all terms above are of a suitable form for our Type II estimates. If $n = 4k$ then we cannot estimate terms with $N(\mathfrak{p}) \in [X^{n-3k-2\epsilon}, X^{k+\epsilon}] \cup [X^{2k-\epsilon}, X^{n-2k+\epsilon}]$, but bounding these terms by $0 \le S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}}, \mathfrak{p}) \le S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}}, \mathfrak{z}_1)$ will introduce an error factor of $(1 + O(\epsilon))$ to the final estimates.

When $n < 4k$, we require a more complicated decomposition based on the use of Harman's sieve. Here we discard some terms through positivity, which restricts us to obtaining a lower bound of the correct order of magnitude. The specific decomposition we use is identical to that of Harman [9], since the ranges of our 'Type I' and 'Type II' estimates will be the same as those for the problem of Diophantine approximation by primes. The only minor difference is that in our case the summations are over prime ideals rather than rational primes, but this does not effect the final estimates since they both have the same density. Since the full decomposition is complicated to write down (and requires non-trivial numerical computation) we just highlight some key details, referring the reader to [9] for a more complete description.

In general we have three ways of transforming terms $S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}}, \mathfrak{a})$ in our decomposition:

(1) Buchstab iterations: Given ideals $\mathfrak{a}_1 < \mathfrak{a}_2$ and $\mathfrak{d}$ with $N(\mathfrak{d}) < X^{n-k-\epsilon}/N(\mathfrak{a}_2)$, we can apply two Buchstab iterations, which gives

$$S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}}, \mathfrak{a}_2) = S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}}, \mathfrak{a}_1) - \sum_{\mathfrak{a}_1 < \mathfrak{p}_1 < \mathfrak{a}_2} S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{p}}, \mathfrak{a}_1) + \sum_{\mathfrak{a}_1 < \mathfrak{p}_2 < \mathfrak{p}_1 < \mathfrak{a}_2} S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{p}_1\mathfrak{p}_2}, \mathfrak{p}_2).$$

We can obtain asymptotic estimates for the first two sums if $\mathfrak{a}_1 = \mathfrak{z}_1$ and the terms in the final sum which fall into our Type II range; we are left to obtain a lower bound for the remaining terms.

(2) Buchstab expansion: Given ideals $\mathfrak{a}_1 < \mathfrak{a}_2$ and $\mathfrak{d}$ with $N(\mathfrak{d}) < X^{n-k-\epsilon}/N(\mathfrak{a}_2)$, we can apply Buchstab's identity in reverse, which gives

$$S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}}, \mathfrak{a}_1) = S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}}, \mathfrak{a}_2) + \sum_{\mathfrak{a}_1 < \mathfrak{p} < \mathfrak{a}_2} S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{d}}, \mathfrak{p}).$$

We can obtain asymptotic estimates for some terms in the final sum which coincide with our Type II range; we are left to obtain a lower bound for the other terms.

(3) Reversal of roles: If $\mathcal{T}$ is a set of ideals $\mathfrak{t}$ satisfying $\mathfrak{b} < \mathfrak{t} < \mathfrak{b}^2$, we can write

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{T}} S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{p}}, \mathfrak{a}) = \sum_{\mathfrak{u} \in \mathcal{U}} S(\mathcal{A}^*_{\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{d}}, \mathfrak{b}),$$

where $\mathcal{A}^*_{\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{d}} = \{\mathfrak{t} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{d}} : \mathfrak{t} \in \mathcal{T}\}$ and $\mathcal{U} = \{\mathfrak{u} : \mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{t} \Rightarrow \mathfrak{p} > \mathfrak{a}\}$.

Having applied these transformations in some combination a finite number of times, we end up with a decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} S(\mathcal{A},\mathfrak{z}_2) = &\sum_{\mathfrak{d}\in\mathcal{D}_1} S(\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{z}_1) - \sum_{\mathfrak{d}\in\mathcal{D}_2} S(\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{z}_1) + \sum_{\mathcal{R}}\sum_{\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{a}) \\ &- \sum_{\mathcal{R}'}\sum_{\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}'}(\mathfrak{a}) + \sum_{\mathcal{R}''}\sum_{\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}'}(\mathfrak{a}). \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

Here the sums $\sum_{\mathcal{R}}$, $\sum_{\mathcal{R}'}$, $\sum_{\mathcal{R}''}$ indicate a sum over $O(1)$ polytopes $\mathcal{R},\mathcal{R}',\mathcal{R}''$, which are independent of X and

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{a}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \mathfrak{a}=\mathfrak{p}_1\dots\mathfrak{p}_J \text{ with } N(\mathfrak{p}_i)=X^{e_i}, (e_1,\dots,e_\ell)\in\mathcal{R}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.2}$$

Moreover, the polytopes $\mathcal{R},\mathcal{R}'$ appearing have the property that $(e_1,\dots,e_\ell)\in\mathcal{R}$ or $\mathcal{R}'$ then $e_i\geq\epsilon^2$ for all i and there exists an $\ell_2\leq\ell$ such that $k+\epsilon\leq\sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i\leq n-2k-\epsilon$. In particular, if $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{a})\neq 0$ then $\mathfrak{a}$ can be written as $\mathfrak{a}=\mathfrak{a}_1\mathfrak{a}_2$ with $N(\mathfrak{a}_2)$ in the Type II range $[X^{k+\epsilon},X^{n-2k-\epsilon}]$. The sets $\mathcal{D}_1,\mathcal{D}_2$ contain only ideals $\mathfrak{d}$ with $N(\mathfrak{d})<X^{n-k-\epsilon}$ and any prime factor $\mathfrak{p}$ of $\mathfrak{d}$ has $\mathfrak{p}>\mathfrak{z}_1$.

The first two sums in (5.1) represent the sieve terms for which we can obtain an asymptotic formula from our Type I and Type II information. The next two sums (involving $\mathcal{R}$ or $\mathcal{R}'$) can also be asymptotically evaluated since any ideal counted in these sums factors in a way such that we can use our Type II estimate to obtain an asymptotic formula. The final term represents the part of the decomposition which we cannot estimate asymptotically, and we will trivially bound it below by zero.

To keep track of these terms, we perform the identical decompositions to a simpler set $\mathcal{B}$, which we use to compare to $\mathcal{A}$. Let $\mathfrak{a}_0=(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k}(\mathbf{a}_0)_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})$ be the ideal generated by the integer corresponding to $\mathbf{a}_0$, and let χ^* be the quadratic character on ideals $\pmod{q^*}$. Let $X\ll N_0\ll X$ be such that the smallest norm of an ideal in $\mathcal{A}$ is N_0^n. We then define $\mathcal{B}$ by

$$\mathcal{B}=\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a}_0)=\{\mathfrak{b}:\, N(\mathfrak{b})\in[N_0^n,(1+\eta_1^{1/2})N_0^n],\, \chi^*(\mathfrak{b})=\chi^*(\mathfrak{a}_0)\}.$$

Applying the same decomposition (5.1) to $\mathcal{B}$, and subtracting these terms multiplied be a weight λ from the decomposition of $\mathcal{A}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} S(\mathcal{A},\mathfrak{z}_2) &= \lambda S(\mathcal{B},\mathfrak{z}_2) - \lambda\sum_{\mathcal{R}''}\sum_{\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{B}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}''}(\mathfrak{b}) + \sum_{\mathfrak{d}\in\mathcal{D}_1}\Big(S(\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{z}_1)-\lambda S(\mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{z}_1)\Big) \\ &\quad - \sum_{\mathfrak{d}\in\mathcal{D}_2}\Big(S(\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{z}_1)-\lambda S(\mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{z}_1)\Big) + \sum_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\sum_{\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{a}) - \lambda\sum_{\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{B}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{b})\Big) \\ &\quad - \sum_{\mathcal{R}'}\Big(\sum_{\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}'}(\mathfrak{a}) - \lambda\sum_{\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{B}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}'}(\mathfrak{b})\Big) + \sum_{\mathcal{R}''}\sum_{\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}''}(\mathfrak{a}) \\ &\geq \lambda\Big(S(\mathcal{B},\mathfrak{z}_2) - \lambda\sum_{\mathcal{R}''}\sum_{\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{B}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}''}(\mathfrak{b})\Big) - \sum_{i\in\{1,2\}}\Big|\sum_{\mathfrak{d}\in\mathcal{D}_i}\Big(S(\mathcal{A}_\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{z}_1)-\lambda S(\mathcal{B}_\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{z}_1)\Big)\Big| \\ &\quad - \sum_{\mathcal{R}}\Big|\sum_{\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{a}) - \lambda\sum_{\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{B}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{b})\Big| - \sum_{\mathcal{R}'}\Big|\sum_{\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}'}(\mathfrak{a}) - \lambda\sum_{\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{B}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}'}(\mathfrak{b})\Big| \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Here we have dropped the non-negative term $\sum_{\mathcal{R}''}\sum_{\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}''}(\mathfrak{a})$ for a lower bound. Assuming the two following key propositions, we will then obtain Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 (for $K=\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt[n]{\theta})$).

Proposition 5.1 (Type II sums)**.** *Let $\mathcal{R}\subseteq[\epsilon^2,n]^\ell$ be a polytope in $\mathbb{R}^\ell$ such that $(\xi_1,\dots,\xi_\ell)\in\mathcal{R}\Rightarrow k+\epsilon<\sum_{j=1}^{\ell_1}\xi_j<n-2k-\epsilon$ for some $\ell_1\le\ell$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{a})-\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\#\mathcal{B}}\sum_{\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{B}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{b})\ll\eta_1\#\mathcal{A}.$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}&=\prod_{p\nmid q^*}\Big(1-\frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big)\Big(1-\frac{\nu_2(p)}{p^n}\Big)^{-1},\\ \nu(p)&=\#\{1\le a_1,\dots,a_{n-k}\le p:\ N_K(\mathbf{a})\equiv 0\ (\mathrm{mod}\ p)\},\\ \nu_2(p)&=\#\{1\le a_1,\dots,a_n\le p:\ N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})\equiv 0\ (\mathrm{mod}\ p)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 5.2 (Sieve asymptotic terms)**.** *We have*

$$\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{d})<X^{n-k-\epsilon}\\ \mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{d}\Rightarrow\mathfrak{p}>\mathfrak{z}_1}}\Big|S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}},\mathfrak{z}_1)-\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\#\mathcal{B}}S(\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{d}},\mathfrak{z}_1)\Big|\ll\frac{\exp(-\epsilon^{-1/2})\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\prod_{p|q^*}\Big(1-\frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big)^{-1}.$$

Here $\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}$ and $\nu(p)$ are as in Proposition 5.1.

By Proposition 5.1 and 5.2, the last three terms on the right hand side of (5.3) are negligible on choosing $\lambda=\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\#\mathcal{A}/\#\mathcal{B}$. This will then give us the lower bound

$$S(\mathcal{A},\mathfrak{z}_2)\ge\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\#\mathcal{B}}\Big(S(\mathcal{B},\mathfrak{z}_2)-\sum_{\mathcal{R}''}\sum_{\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{B}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}''}(\mathfrak{b})\Big)+O\Big(\frac{\epsilon\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\prod_{p|q^*}\Big(1-\frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big)^{-1}\Big).$$

In the case $n\ge 4k$, the corresponding expression is

$$\begin{aligned}S(\mathcal{A},\mathfrak{z}_2)&=\lambda S(\mathcal{B},\mathfrak{z}_2)+\Big(S(\mathcal{A},\mathfrak{z}_1)-\lambda S(\mathcal{B},\mathfrak{z}_1)\Big)-\sum_{\mathfrak{z}_1<\mathfrak{p}<\mathfrak{z}_2}\Big(S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}},\mathfrak{p})-\lambda S(\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{p}},\mathfrak{p})\Big)\\ &=\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\#\mathcal{B}}S(\mathcal{B},\mathfrak{z}_2)+O\Big(\frac{\epsilon\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\prod_{p|q^*}\Big(1-\frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big)^{-1}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathrm{Res}_{s=1}(L(s,\chi^{*2})+L(s,\chi^*))/2=\gamma_K q^{*n}/\phi_K((q^*))$, it follows that we have $\#\mathcal{B}=(1+o(1))\eta_1^{1/2}\gamma_K N_0^n q^{*n}/2\phi_K((q^*))$. Trivially we have that $\#\mathcal{A}=(1+o(1))\eta_1^{n-k}(q^*)^{-(n-k)}\prod_{i=1}^{n-k}X_i$.

We now sum over all $\mathbf{a}_0\in[1,q^*]^{n-k}$ with $N(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k}(\mathbf{a}_0)_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})$ coprime to q^*, which will remove any possible distortions in the density of prime ideals (mod q^*). We can asymptotically estimate the remaining terms (since these only involve the simple set $\mathcal{B}$), which is summarised by the following Lemma.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^\ell$ be a polytope contained in $[\epsilon^2, n]^\ell$ which is independent of X. Then*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a}_0 \in [1,q^*]^{n-k}} \sum_{\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a}_0)} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{b}) = \frac{(q^*)^{n-k}\eta_1^{1/2} N_0^n}{2\log X} \prod_{p \mid q^*} \Big(1 - \frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big) \Big(\int \cdots \int_{\substack{(e_1,\dots,e_\ell)\in\mathcal{R} \\ \sum_{i=1}^n e_i = n}} \frac{de_1 \dots de_{\ell-1}}{e_1 \dots e_\ell} + o(1)\Big).$$

The integral above is interpreted as $1/n$ if $\ell = 1$.

We see that

$$\frac{\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}}{\#\mathcal{B}} \frac{(q^*)^{n-k}\eta_1^{1/2} N_0^n}{2\log X} \prod_{p \mid q^*} \Big(1 - \frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big) = (q^*)^{n-k} \frac{\tilde{\mathfrak{S}} q^{*n}(1+o(1))}{\gamma_K \phi_K((q^*))} \prod_{p \mid q^*} \Big(1 - \frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big),$$

and, recalling $\gamma_K = \prod (1-\nu_2(p)p^{-n})(1-p^{-1})$ is the residue at $s=1$ of $\zeta_K(s)$, we find that

$$\frac{q^{*n}}{\gamma_K \phi_K(q^*)} \tilde{\mathfrak{S}} \prod_{p \mid q^*} \Big(1 - \frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big) = \mathfrak{S}.$$

Also, there are $\prod_{p \mid q} (1 - \nu(p) p^{-(n-k)})$ vectors $\mathbf{a}_0$ with $\gcd(N(\mathfrak{a}_0), q^*) = 1$. Thus, in the case $n \geq 4k$, this gives

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a}_0 \in [1,q^*]^{n-k}} S(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{z}_2) = (1 + O(\epsilon)) \frac{\mathfrak{S} \# \mathscr{A}}{n \log X},$$

as required for Theorem 1.1. In the case $n < 4k$, this gives

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a}_0 \in [1,q^*]^{n-k}} S(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{z}_2) \geq \frac{\mathfrak{S} \# \mathscr{A}}{n \log X} \Big(1 - \sum_{\mathcal{R}''} I_{\mathcal{R}''} + O(\epsilon)\Big).$$

where, if $\mathcal{R}'' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^\ell$

$$I_{\mathcal{R}''} = n \int \cdots \int_{\substack{(e_1,\dots,e_\ell)\in\mathcal{R}'' \\ \sum_{i=1}^\ell e_i = n}} \frac{de_1 \dots de_{\ell-1}}{e_1 \dots e_\ell}.$$

Thus we obtain a lower bound of the correct order of magnitude

$$\#\Big\{ \mathbf{x} \in [X_i, X_i + \eta_1 X_i]^{n-k} : N\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} x_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}} \Big) \text{ prime} \Big\} \gg \frac{\mathfrak{S} \eta_1^{n-k} X^{n-k}}{\log X},$$

provided we can choose our decomposition such that $\sum_{\mathcal{R}''} I_{\mathcal{R}''} < 0.99$, say. Since the range of the asymptotic regions is strictly decreasing as k/n increases, establishing that $\sum_{\mathcal{R}''} I_{\mathcal{R}''} < 0.99$ when $k/n = c_0$ certainly gives a suitable lower bound for all $k/n \leq c_0$.

Since we use the same decomposition as Harman in [9] the integrals $I_{\mathcal{R}''}$ are identical to those produced in his problem (although his notation is somewhat different.) This means we can make use of Harman's numerical calculations which show that (in our notation) $\sum_{\mathcal{R}''} I_{\mathcal{R}''} < 0.891$ when $k/n = 0.3182$, thereby giving the result for $n \geq k/0.3182$. Since $0.3182 < 7/22$, the result follows.

Thus, to establish Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 for $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt[n]{\theta})$, it suffices to prove Lemma 5.3, and Propositions 5.1 and 5.2.

6. Type I sums

In this section we establish Lemma 5.3 and Proposition 5.2 under the assumption of Proposition 5.1 by using estimates from the geometry of numbers.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\mathcal{R}\subseteq\mathbb{R}^\ell$ a region such that any line parallel to the coordinate axes intersects $\mathcal{R}$ in $O(1)$ intervals. Then we have*

$$\#\{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{Z}^\ell\cap\mathcal{R}\}=\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}+O\Big(1+\sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1}\frac{V_j}{\prod_{i=1}^{\ell-j}Z_i}\Big),$$

where V_j is the sum of the $\ell-j$ dimensional volumes of the projections of $\mathcal{R}$ formed by equating any j coordinates to zero. In particular, if $\mathcal{R}\subseteq[-B,B]^\ell$ and $\Lambda\subseteq\mathbb{Z}^\ell$ is a rank ℓ lattice with successive minima $Z_1\le\cdots\le Z_{\ell-k}$, then we have

$$\#\{\mathbf{x}\in\Lambda\cap\mathcal{R}\}=\frac{\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}}{\det(\Lambda)}+O\Big(1+\sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1}\frac{B^j}{\prod_{i=1}^{j}Z_i}\Big).$$

Proof. The first statement is Davenport's theorem [3]. For the second statement, there is a basis $\mathbf{z}_1,\dots,\mathbf{z}_\ell$ of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ with $\|\mathbf{z}_i\|\ll Z_i$ and $\|\sum_{i=1}^\ell a_i\mathbf{z}_i\|\gg\sum_{i=1}^\ell\|a_i\mathbf{z}_i\|$. Letting M be the $\ell\times\ell$ matrix with columns $\mathbf{z}_1,\dots,\mathbf{z}_\ell$, we see that counting $\mathbf{x}\in\Lambda\cap\mathcal{R}$ is the same as counting $\mathbf{x}'\in\mathbb{Z}^\ell\cap M^{-1}\mathcal{R}$. This region has volume $\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}/\det(M)=\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}/\det(\Lambda)$, and since $\|\sum_{i=1}^\ell a_i\mathbf{z}_i\|\ll\sum_{i=1}^\ell\|a_i\mathbf{z}_i\|\ll B$ we have $|a_i|\ll B/Z_i$, so in this case $V_j=O(B^{\ell-j}/\prod_{i=1}^{\ell-j}Z_i)$. □

Lemma 6.2. *Let $\mathcal{R}=\mathcal{R}(X)\subseteq[-X,X]^{n-k}$ be a region depending on the parameter X satisfying the conditions of Lemma 6.1 (with $\ell=n-k$) such that $\mathcal{R}$ contains a hypercube of side length $X^{1-1/2n}$. Then, for any fixed Q and any $\mathbf{x}_0\in\mathbb{Z}^n$ we have*

$$\lim_{X\to\infty}\frac{\#\{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{Z}^{n-k}\cap\mathcal{R}:\ \mathbf{x}\equiv\mathbf{x}_0\pmod Q\}}{\#\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}}=\frac{1}{Q^{n-k}}.$$

Proof. We choose $\mathbf{y}\in\mathcal{R}$ such that $\mathbf{y}\equiv\mathbf{x}_0\pmod Q$, which clearly exists (for X large enough) since $\mathcal{R}$ contains a hypercube of side length $X^{1-1/2n}>Q$. We then let $\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{y}+Q\mathbf{x}'$, and so $\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{R}$ if $\mathbf{x}'$ is in a translated, scaled copy of $\mathcal{R}$. The number of such $\mathbf{x}'$ is $\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}/Q^{n-k}+O(X^{n-k-1}/Q^{n-k-1})$ by Lemma 6.1. But $\mathcal{R}$ contains a hypercube of side length $X^{1-1/2n}$, so this is $(1+o(1))\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}/Q^{n-k}$. □

Proposition 6.3 (Type I estimate)**.** *Let $n>3k$. Given a region $\mathcal{R}\subseteq[-X,X]^{n-k}$ satisfying the same conditions as Lemma 6.2, and a vector $\mathbf{x}_0\in\mathbb{Z}^{n-k}$, and a quantity $Q\le X^{1/2}$, we define the set*

$$\mathscr{C}=\Big\{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}:\ \mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{R},\ \mathbf{x}\equiv\mathbf{x}_0\ (\mathrm{mod}\ Q)\Big\}.$$

We let $\mathscr{C}_{\mathfrak{d}}=\{c\in\mathscr{C}:\mathfrak{d}|(c)\}$ be the elements of $\mathscr{C}$ which generate an ideal which is a multiple of $\mathfrak{d}$. Then we have

$$\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{d})\in[D,2D]\\ \gcd(N(\mathfrak{d}),Q)=1}}\Big|\#\mathscr{C}_{\mathfrak{d}}-\frac{\rho(\mathfrak{d})\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}}{Q^{n-k}N(\mathfrak{d})}\Big|\ll X^{n-k-1}Q^{n+o(1)}D^{1/(n-k)+o(1)}+DQ^{n+o(1)}.$$

In particular, taking $\mathcal{R} = [X_1, X_1 + \eta_1 X_1] \times \cdots \times [X_{n-k}, X_{n-k} + \eta_1 X_{n-k}]$, $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{a}_0$ *and* $Q = q^*$, *we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{d}) \in [D, 2D] \\ \gcd(N(\mathfrak{d}), q^*) = 1}} \left| \#\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}} - \frac{\rho(\mathfrak{d}) \#\mathcal{A}}{N(\mathfrak{d})} \right| \ll X^{n-k-1+o(1)} D^{1/(n-k)+o(1)} + DX^{o(1)}.$$

Here ρ *is the function defined by*

$$\rho(\mathfrak{d}) = \frac{\#\{\mathbf{x} \in [1, N(\mathfrak{d})]^{n-k} : \mathfrak{d} | (\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} x_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})\}}{N(\mathfrak{d})^{n-k-1}}.$$

Proof. We consider separately the contribution from ideals $\mathfrak{d}$ occurring in each class $\mathcal{C} \in Cl_K$. Given a class $\mathcal{C}$, we fix a representative integral ideal $\mathfrak{c} \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\gcd(N(\mathfrak{c}), Q) = 1$. We can choose such an ideal with $N(\mathfrak{c}) \ll \log Q$. We let $(\delta_{\mathfrak{c}})$ be the principal fractional ideal $\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}^{-1}$, where the generator $\delta_{\mathfrak{c}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}/(\theta n N(\mathfrak{c}))^n$ is chosen such that $d_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $d_i \ll N(\mathfrak{c})^{n-1} N(\mathfrak{d})^{1/n} \ll D^{1/n} Q^{o(1)}$. There is such a representation, since $\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}^{-1}(N(\mathfrak{c}))$ is integral and $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]$ is an order in $\mathcal{O}_K$ of index dividing $(\theta n)^n$, and by multiplying by units one can ensure all coefficients have the appropriate size. This gives the upper bound $|\delta_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\sigma}| \ll D^{1/n} Q^{o(1)}$ for every embedding $\sigma : K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Since $N(\mathfrak{d}) \gg D$ we also have the lower bound $|\delta_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\sigma}| = N(\delta_{\mathfrak{c}}) / \prod_{\sigma' \neq \sigma} |\delta_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\sigma'}| \gg D^{1/n} Q^{-o(1)}$.

We see that

$$\begin{aligned} \#\{\alpha \in \mathscr{C} : \mathfrak{d} | (\alpha)\} &= \#\{\alpha \in \mathscr{C} : (\alpha) = \mathfrak{a}'\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{a}'\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}^{-1} \in \mathscr{C} \text{ some integral } \mathfrak{a}'\} \\ &= \#\{\beta \in K : \delta_{\mathfrak{c}}\beta \in \mathscr{C},\, \mathfrak{c} | (\beta)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have put β as a generator of the principal ideal $\mathfrak{a}'\mathfrak{c}$.

We let $\beta = (\theta n)^{-n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ with $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. This representation is unique provided $\mathbf{b}$ satisfies some linear constraints $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{b}) \equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod{(\theta n)^n}$. (Since $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]$ is an order in $\mathcal{O}_K$ of index dividing $(\theta n)^n$.) Moreover, we may introduce a further linear restriction $\pmod{(\theta n)^n}$ to ensure $\beta\delta_{\mathfrak{c}} \in \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]$. We write $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}(\mathbf{b}) \equiv \mathbf{0}$ for these restrictions. We now split the count into residue classes mod $q = Q(\theta n N(\mathfrak{c}))^n$, so that we are left to estimate

$$\sum_{\mathbf{b}_0}{}' \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \\ \mathbf{b} \equiv \mathbf{b}_0 \pmod{q} \\ \delta_{\mathfrak{c}}\beta \in \mathscr{C}}} 1. \tag{6.1}$$

Here $\sum'_{\mathbf{b}_0}$ indicates we sum over $\mathbf{b}_0 \in (\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^n$ with the restrictions that the ideal generated by $\beta_0 = (\theta n)^{-n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\mathbf{b}_0)_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ must be a multiple of $\mathfrak{c}$, that $\beta_0\delta_{\mathfrak{c}}$ has coefficients of $\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ which are zero mod q for $i > n-k$, that $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}(\mathbf{b}_0) \equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod{(\theta n)^n}$, and that $\delta_{\mathfrak{c}}\beta_0 \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} (\mathbf{x}_0)_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}} \pmod{Q}$.

We concentrate on the inner sum. We let $\mathfrak{d} \diamond \mathbf{b}$ denote the vector $\mathbf{c}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}} = (\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})$. We see that the coefficients c_i are given by bilinear expressions in the coefficients d_i, b_i so $c_j = 0$ for $n-k < j \leq n$ is equivalent to $L_{i,\mathbf{d}}(\mathbf{b}) = 0$ for k linearly independent functions $L_{1,\mathbf{d}}, \ldots, L_{k,\mathbf{d}}$. (They are linearly independent since otherwise Lemma 6.2 would not hold). These constraints force $\mathbf{b}$ to lie in a rank $n-k$ lattice $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}$. Since the coefficients of

the functions are of size $\ll \max_i d_i \ll D^{1/n}Q^{o(1)}$, this lattice has determinant $\ll D^{k/n}Q^{o(1)}$. (This bound follows from considering the dual lattice, and is also immediate from Lemma 8.1.)

There is clearly a vector $\mathbf{b}^{(1)}$ in the lattice $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}$ such that $\beta_1 = (\theta n)^{-n}\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^{(1)}\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ satisfies $\beta_1 \equiv \beta_0 \pmod q$ since there is an $\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} a_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}} \in \mathscr{C}$ with $\alpha \equiv \delta_{\mathfrak{c}}\beta_0 \pmod q$. We then let $\beta = \beta_1 + q\beta_2$, with $\beta_2 = (\theta n)^{-n}\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^{(2)}\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ for some $\mathbf{b}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Thus we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbb{Z}^n\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0 \pmod q\\ \delta_{\mathfrak{c}}\beta\in\mathscr{C}}} 1 = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}^{(2)}\in\Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}\\ \delta_{\mathfrak{c}}\beta_1+q\delta_{\mathfrak{c}}\beta_2\in\mathscr{C}}} 1.$$

We let $\mathbf{z}_1,\dots,\mathbf{z}_{n-k} = \mathbf{z}_1(\mathfrak{d}),\dots,\mathbf{z}_{n-k}(\mathfrak{d})$ be a basis of the rank $n-k$ lattice $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}$, ordered such that $\|\mathbf{z}_1\| \le \cdots \le \|\mathbf{z}_{n-k}\|$ and satisfying $\prod_{i=1}^{n-k}\|\mathbf{z}_i\| \ll \det(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}})$. Thus $\mathbf{b}^{(2)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} b_i'\mathbf{z}_i$ for some coefficients $b_i' \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $|\delta_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\sigma}| \gg D^{1/n}q^{o(1)}$ and any $\alpha \in \mathscr{C}$ has $|\alpha^{\sigma}| \ll X^{1/n}$, we see that $|(\beta_1+q\beta_2)^{\sigma}| \ll (X/D)^{1/n}q^{o(1)}$ for all embeddings σ. In particular, this means that $\|\mathbf{b}^{(1)} - \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} b_i'\mathbf{z}_i\| \ll X^{1/n}D^{-1/n}q^{-1+o(1)}$, so b_i' must lie in an interval of length $\ll X^{1/n}D^{-1/n}\|\mathbf{z}_i\|^{-1} \ll X^{1/n}D^{-1/n}\|\mathbf{z}_1\|^{-1}$.

The conditions $\mathbf{b}_2^{(2)} \in \Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}$ and $\delta_{\mathfrak{c}}\beta_1 + q\delta_{\mathfrak{c}}\beta_2 \in \mathscr{C}$ is equivalent to $M_{\mathfrak{d}}\mathbf{b}' \in \mathcal{R}'$, for some suitable $(n-k)\times(n-k)$ non-singular matrix $M_{\mathfrak{d}}$ depending on $\mathfrak{d}, q, \mathfrak{c}$ but not X, and for some region $\mathcal{R}'$ which is a translate of $\mathcal{R}$. Thus, by Lemma 6.1 (recalling each of the b_i' lie in an interval of length $O(X^{1/n}D^{-1/n}\|\mathbf{z}_1\|^{-1})$) we have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{b}'\in\mathbb{Z}^{n-k}\cap M_{\mathfrak{d}}^{-1}\mathcal{R}} 1 = \frac{\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}'}{\det(M_{\mathfrak{d}})} + O\Big(1 + \frac{X^{n-k-1}}{\|\mathbf{z}_1(\mathfrak{d})\|^{n-k-1}D^{(n-k-1)/n}}\Big). \tag{6.2}$$

Since $\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}' = \operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}$ is independent of $\mathfrak{d}$, and $\det M_{\mathfrak{d}}$ and $\sum_{\mathbf{b}_0}'$ are independent of X, we have (using Lemma 6.2 for the final equality)

$$\sum_{\mathbf{b}_0}' \frac{\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}'}{\det(M_{\mathfrak{d}})} = \operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}\sum_{\mathbf{b}_0}' \frac{1}{\det M_{\mathfrak{d}}} = \frac{\rho(\mathfrak{d})\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}}{Q^{n-k}N(\mathfrak{d})}.$$

This gives us the main term contribution in the result. We are therefore left to show that the contribution from the error terms in (6.2) summed over all $\mathfrak{d} \in \mathscr{C}$ with $N(\mathfrak{d}) \ll D$ is $O(X^{n-k-1}D^{1/(n-k)+o(1)}q^{o(1)} + D)$, since there are $O(q^n)$ choices of $\mathbf{b}_0 \in (\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^n$ and $\mathcal{C} \in Cl_K$. The $O(1)$ term in (6.2) clearly contributes $O(D)$, which is acceptable. We note that

$$\|\mathbf{z}_1(\mathfrak{d})\| \le (\|\mathbf{z}_1(\mathfrak{d})\|\dots\|\mathbf{z}_{n-k}(\mathfrak{d})\|)^{1/(n-k)} \ll \det(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}})^{1/(n-k)} \ll D^{k/(n^2-kn)}q^{o(1)},$$

and recall that $\sum_{i=1}^k d_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}} = \mathfrak{d}(\theta n)^n N(\mathfrak{c})/\mathfrak{c}$ determines $\mathfrak{d}$ uniquely and has $\|\mathbf{d}\| \ll D^{1/n}q^{o(1)}$. Moreover, since $\mathbf{z}_1(\mathfrak{d}) \in \Lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}$, we have $(\mathbf{d}\diamond\mathbf{z}_1)_j = 0$ $(n-k < j \le n)$. Finally, given $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, there are at most $\tau(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} x_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}) \ll \|\mathbf{x}\|^{o(1)}$ choices of $\mathbf{d}$

and $\mathbf{z}_1(\mathfrak{d})$ such that $\mathbf{z}_1(\mathfrak{d}) \diamond \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{x}$. Putting this together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{D_1 \le N(\mathfrak{d}) < 2D_1 \\ Z_1 \le \|\mathbf{z}_1(\mathfrak{d})\| < 2Z_1}} 1 &\le \sum_{Z_1 \le \|\mathbf{z}_1\| < 2Z_1} \sum_{\substack{\|\mathbf{d}\| \ll D_1^{1/n} q^{o(1)} \\ (\mathbf{d} \diamond \mathbf{z}_1)_j = 0 \text{ if } j > n-k}} 1 \\ &\le \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-k} \\ \|\mathbf{x}\| \ll D_1^{1/n} Z_1 q^{o(1)}}} \tau\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} x_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}\Big) \\ &\le D_1^{(n-k)/n + o(1)} Z_1^{n-k+o(1)} q^{o(1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, since $\|\mathbf{z}_1\|^{n-k} \ll D^{k/n} q^{o(1)}$, the total contribution from the error term $O(X^{n-k-1} N(\mathfrak{d})^{-(n-k-1)/n} \|z_1\|^{-(n-k-1)})$ in (6.2) is

$$\sum_{\substack{D_1 = 2^{j_1} \\ D_1 \ll D}} \sum_{\substack{Z_1 = 2^{j_2} \\ Z_1^{n-k} \ll D^{k/n} q^{o(1)}}} \frac{X^{n-k-1} Z_1^{n-k} D_1^{(n-k)/n} (Z_1 D_1 q)^{o(1)}}{Z_1^{n-k-1} D_1^{(n-k-1)/n}} \ll X^{n-k-1} D^{1/(n-k)} (Dq)^{o(1)},$$

as required. □

Lemma 6.4.

$$\sum_{N(\mathfrak{d}) \le D} \Big| \#\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{d}} - \frac{\#\mathcal{B}}{N(\mathfrak{d})} \Big| \ll X^{n-1+o(1)} D^{1/n}.$$

Proof. This follows from a classical theorem of Weber that the number of ideals $\mathfrak{a}$ of norm at most Y with $\chi^*(\mathfrak{a}) = \chi^*(\mathfrak{a}_0)$ is $\gamma_K q^{*n} Y / 2\phi_K(q^*) + O((q^*)^n Y^{1-1/n})$, where $\gamma_K = \operatorname{Res}_{s=1} \zeta_K(s)$. Letting $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{d}}$, this gives

$$\begin{aligned}\#\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{d}} &= \#\Big\{\mathfrak{a} : \frac{X^n}{N(\mathfrak{d})} \le N(\mathfrak{a}) \le \frac{X^n(1+\eta_1^{1/2})}{N(\mathfrak{d})},\ \chi^*(\mathfrak{a}) = \chi^*(\mathfrak{a}_0)\Big\} \\ &= \frac{\eta_1^{1/2} \gamma_K q^{*n} X^n}{2\phi_K(q^*) N(\mathfrak{d})} + O\Big(\frac{X^{n-1+o(1)}}{N(\mathfrak{d})^{1-1/n}}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Summing over $\mathfrak{d}$ then gives the result. □

Lemma 6.5. *(i) $\rho(\mathfrak{p}) = 1$ for any degree one prime ideal.*
(ii) We have

$$\#\{\mathbf{x} \in [1, p^2]^{n-k} : p^2 | N(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} x_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})\} \ll p^{2n-2k-2}.$$

In particular, for any ideal with $N(\mathfrak{e})$ a power of p, we have

$$\frac{\rho(\mathfrak{e})}{N(\mathfrak{p})} \ll \frac{1}{p^2}$$

unless $\mathfrak{e}$ is a degree 1 prime ideal above p.
(iii) $\rho(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}) = \rho(\mathfrak{a})\rho(\mathfrak{b})$ if $\gcd(N(\mathfrak{a}), N(\mathfrak{b})) = 1$.

Proof. (i) Let $N(\mathfrak{p}) = p$. There exists $\mathbf{a} \in [1, p]^n$ such that $\mathfrak{p} | (\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})$ but $p^2 \nmid N(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})$ (since there are asymptotically more ideals a multiple of $\mathfrak{p}$ then having norm a multiple of p^2, by Lemma 6.4). But then the

multiplication-by-$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ matrix has rank $n-1$ over $\mathbb{F}_p$, so the p^{n-1} distinct multiples of $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ in $\{\sum_{i=1}^n b_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}} \pmod p : b_i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ are all the elements of $\mathcal{O}_K/p\mathcal{O}_K$ which generate an ideal which is a multiple of $\mathfrak{p}$. Finally, we note that $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ being congruent to a multiple of $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ is equivalent to $L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{b}) \equiv 0 \pmod p$ for some linear function $L_{\mathfrak{p}}$, since the multiplication-by-$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ matrix has rank $n-1$. Therefore $\rho(\mathfrak{p})$ counts the number of $\mathbf{x} \in [1,p]^{n-k}$ such that $L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{x})$ vanishes mod p. But $N(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} x_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})$ has no fixed prime divisor so $L_{\mathfrak{p}}$ cannot vanish of $[1,p]^{n-k}$, and so there are p^{n-k-1} such $\mathbf{x}$, giving $\rho(\mathfrak{p}) = 1$.

(ii) We may assume $p \nmid \Delta_K$ since $\Delta_K = O(1)$. But $N(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} x_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})$ is an irreducible polynomial over $\mathbb{Q}$ (seen by considering $N(x_1 + x_2\sqrt[n]{\theta})$), and so the result follows immediately.

(iii) This follows immediately from the Chinese remainder theorem. □

Lemma 6.6 (Fundamental Lemma)**.** *Let $\mathfrak{z}_0$ be chosen maximally with $N(\mathfrak{z}_0) \le X^{\epsilon^2}$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{d})<X^{n-k-\epsilon}\\ \mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{d}\Rightarrow\mathfrak{p}>\mathfrak{z}_0}} \Big|S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}},\mathfrak{z}_0) - \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\#\mathcal{B}}S(\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{d}},\mathfrak{z}_0)\Big| \ll \frac{\exp(\epsilon^{-1/2})}{\log X}\#\mathcal{A}\prod_{p|q^*}\Big(1-\frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big)^{-1}.$$

Proof. We first relate the estimate to a sieving problem over $\mathbb{Q}$, where the result then follows from the classical 'fundamental lemma' of sieve methods. We have

$$\begin{aligned} S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}},\mathfrak{z}_0) &= \#\{\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}} : \mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{a}\Rightarrow\mathfrak{p}>\mathfrak{z}_0\}\\ &= \#\{\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}} : p|N(\mathfrak{a})\Rightarrow p\ge X^{\epsilon^2}\} + O\Big(\sum_{p\in[X^{\epsilon^2/n},X^{\epsilon^2}]}\#\{\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}} : p^2|N(\mathfrak{a})\}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 6.3 and Lemma 6.5, the final term is $O(X^{n-k-\epsilon^2/n})$. The first term is a classical sieve quantity. By Proposition 6.3 we have for $\gcd(e,N(\mathfrak{d}))=1$ and $\gcd(q^*,eN(\mathfrak{d}))=1$ that

$$\#\{\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}} : e|N(\mathfrak{a})\} = \frac{\rho_2(e)\rho(\mathfrak{d})\#\mathcal{A}}{N(\mathfrak{d})} + O(R_{\mathfrak{d}}(e))),$$

where ρ_2 is the multiplicative function arising from inclusion-exclusion defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_2(p) &= \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\\ p|N(\mathfrak{p})}}\frac{\rho(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})} - \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}_1<\mathfrak{p}_2\\ p|N(\mathfrak{p}_1),N(\mathfrak{p}_2)}}\frac{\rho(\mathfrak{p}_1\mathfrak{p}_2)}{N(\mathfrak{p}_1\mathfrak{p}_2)}+\dots\\ &= \frac{\#\{\mathbf{a}\in[1,p^n]^{n-k} : p|N(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k}a_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})\}}{p^{n(n-k)}} = \frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}},\end{aligned}$$

and where the error terms $R_{\mathfrak{d}}(e)$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{d})<X^{n-k-\epsilon}\\ \mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{d}\Rightarrow\mathfrak{p}>\mathfrak{z}_0}}\sum_{\substack{e<X^{\epsilon/(2n^2)}\\ \gcd(e,q^*N(\mathfrak{d}))=1}} R_{\mathfrak{d}}(e) &\le \sum_{N(\mathfrak{d})<X^{n-k-\epsilon}}\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{e})<X^{\epsilon/2n}\\ \gcd(N(\mathfrak{e}),q^*N(\mathfrak{d}))=1}}\Big|\#\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{e}} - \frac{\rho(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{e})}{N(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{e})}\#\mathcal{A}\Big|\\ &\ll X^{n-k-\epsilon/2n}. \qquad (6.3)\end{aligned}$$

We note that we have $\rho_2(p) = \nu(p)/p^{n-k} = \nu_p/p + O(p^{-2})$ by Lemma 6.5, where ν_p is the number of degree one prime ideals of K above p. By the fundamental lemma of sieve methods (see, for example, [6, Theorem 6.9]) and the bound (6.3) we have

$$\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{d})<X^{n-k-\epsilon}\\ \mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{d}\Rightarrow\mathfrak{p}>\mathfrak{z}_0}} \Big|S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}},\mathfrak{z}_0) - \frac{\rho(\mathfrak{d})\#\mathcal{A}}{N(\mathfrak{d})}\prod_{\substack{p<X^{\epsilon^2}\\ p\nmid q^*}}\Big(1-\frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big)\Big|$$

(6.4)

$$\ll \exp(-\epsilon^{-1})\prod_{\substack{p<X^{\epsilon^2}\\ p\nmid q^*}}\Big(1-\frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big)\#\mathcal{A}\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{d})<X^{n-k-\epsilon}\\ \mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{d}\Rightarrow\mathfrak{p}>\mathfrak{z}_0}}\frac{\rho(\mathfrak{d})}{N(\mathfrak{d})} + O(X^{n-k-\epsilon/2n}).$$

The sum over $\mathfrak{d}$ in the final bound is then easily seen to be $O(\epsilon^{-2})$ by an Euler product upper bound and Lemma 6.5.

We now replace $\rho(\mathfrak{d})$ with the constant 1 in the main term of (6.4). Since $\rho(\mathfrak{p}) = 1$ on degree 1 prime ideals, and $\mathfrak{d}$ is restricted to prime factors $\mathfrak{p} > \mathfrak{z}_0$, by Lemma 6.5 we have that

$$\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{d})<X^{n-k-\epsilon}\\ \mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{d}\Rightarrow\mathfrak{p}>\mathfrak{z}_0}}\frac{(\rho(\mathfrak{d})-1)}{N(\mathfrak{d})} \ll \sum_{p>X^{\epsilon^2/n}}\frac{1}{p^2} \ll X^{-\epsilon^2/n},$$

so this change introduces a negligible error. Thus, since $\mathfrak{S} = \prod_p(1-\nu(p)p^{-(n-k)})(1-p^{-1})^{-1} = O(1)$, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{d})<X^{n-k-\epsilon}\\ \mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{d}\Rightarrow\mathfrak{p}>\mathfrak{z}_0}}\Big|S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}},\mathfrak{z}_0) - \frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{N(\mathfrak{d})}\prod_{\substack{p<X^{\epsilon^2}\\ p\nmid q^*}}\Big(1-\frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big)\Big| \ll \frac{\exp(-\epsilon^{-1/2})\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\prod_{p|q^*}\Big(1-\frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big)^{-1}.$$

An identical argument works for the sets $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{d}}$, with $\nu_2(p)/p^n$ instead of $\nu(p)/p^{n-k}$. Subtracting these expressions, and noting the main terms cancel, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{d})<X^{n-k-\epsilon}\\ \mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{d}\Rightarrow\mathfrak{p}>\mathfrak{z}_0}}\Big|S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}},\mathfrak{z}_0) - \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\#\mathcal{B}}S(\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{d}},\mathfrak{z}_0)\Big| \ll \frac{\exp(-\epsilon^{-1/2})}{\log X}\#\mathcal{A}\prod_{p|q^*}\Big(1-\frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big)^{-1}. \ \square$$

Using Lemma 6.6 we can now prove Proposition 5.2, assuming Proposition 5.1.

Proof of Proposition 5.2. To ease notation let $\mathfrak{a}_0, \mathfrak{a}_1, \mathfrak{a}_2, \mathfrak{a}_3$ be chosen maximally with respect to our ordering of ideals subject to $N(\mathfrak{a}_0) \le X^{\epsilon^2}$, $N(\mathfrak{a}_1) \le X^{n-3k-2\epsilon}$, $N(\mathfrak{a}_2) \le X^{k+\epsilon}$ and $N(\mathfrak{a}_3) \le X^{n-2k-\epsilon}$. (We see from this choice that $\mathfrak{a}_0 = \mathfrak{z}_0$ and $\mathfrak{a}_1 = \mathfrak{z}_1$ defined previously.) We first consider the contribution from $\mathfrak{d} \le \mathfrak{a}_2$. We let

$\mathcal{D}=\{\mathfrak{d}:\ \mathfrak{d}\le \mathfrak{a}_2,\ \mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{d}\Rightarrow \mathfrak{p}>\mathfrak{z}_0\}$. Given a set of ideals $\mathcal{C}$ we let

$$T_m(\mathcal{C};\mathfrak{d})=\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a}_0<\mathfrak{p}_m\le\cdots\le\mathfrak{p}_1\le\mathfrak{a}_1\\ \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{p}_1\dots\mathfrak{p}_m\le\mathfrak{a}_2}} S(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{p}_1\dots\mathfrak{p}_m},\mathfrak{a}_0),$$

$$U_m(\mathcal{C};\mathfrak{d})=\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a}_0<\mathfrak{p}_m\le\cdots\le\mathfrak{p}_1\le\mathfrak{a}_1\\ \mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{p}_1\dots\mathfrak{p}_m\le\mathfrak{a}_2}} S(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{p}_1\dots\mathfrak{p}_m},\mathfrak{p}_m),$$

$$V_m(\mathcal{C};\mathfrak{d})=\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a}_0<\mathfrak{p}_m\le\cdots\le\mathfrak{p}_1\le\mathfrak{a}_1\\ \mathfrak{a}_2<\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{p}_1\dots\mathfrak{p}_m\le\mathfrak{a}_3}} S(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{p}_1\dots\mathfrak{p}_m},\mathfrak{p}_m).$$

Since $\mathfrak{a}_2\mathfrak{a}_1\le\mathfrak{a}_3$, we have by Buchstab's identity that

$$U_m(\mathcal{C};\mathfrak{d})=T_m(\mathcal{C};\mathfrak{d})-U_{m+1}(\mathcal{C};\mathfrak{d})-V_{m+1}(\mathcal{C};\mathfrak{d}).$$

We define $T_0(\mathcal{C};\mathfrak{d})=S(\mathcal{C};\mathfrak{a}_0)$ and $V_0(\mathcal{C};\mathfrak{d})=0$. This gives

$$S(\mathcal{C},\mathfrak{a}_1)=T_0(\mathcal{C};\mathfrak{d})-V_1(\mathcal{C};\mathfrak{d})-U_1(\mathcal{C};\mathfrak{d})=\sum_{m\ge 0}(-1)^m(T_m(\mathcal{C};\mathfrak{d})+V_m(\mathcal{C};\mathfrak{d})).$$

We apply the above decomposition to $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}}$. This gives an expression with $O(\epsilon^{-2})$ terms since trivially $T_m(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}})=U_m(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}})=V_m(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}})=0$ if $m>(n-2k-\epsilon)/\epsilon^2$. Applying the same decomposition to $S(\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{d}},\mathfrak{a}_1)$, subtracting the difference, and summing over $\mathfrak{d}\in\mathcal{D}$ we obtain

$$\Big|\sum_{\mathfrak{d}\in\mathcal{D}}S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}},\mathfrak{a}_1)-\lambda\sum_{\mathfrak{d}\in\mathcal{D}}S(\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{d}},\mathfrak{a}_1)\Big|\ll\sum_{0\le m\le n/\epsilon}|\sum_{\mathfrak{d}\in\mathcal{D}}\Big(T_m(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}};\mathfrak{d})-\lambda T_m(\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{d}};\mathfrak{d})\Big)\Big|$$
$$+\sum_{0\le m\le n/\epsilon}\Big|\sum_{\mathfrak{d}\in\mathcal{D}}\Big(V_m(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}};\mathfrak{d})-\lambda V_m(\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{d}};\mathfrak{d})\Big)\Big|.$$

By Lemma 6.6 we have

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{d}}(T_m(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}};\mathfrak{d})-\lambda T_m(\mathcal{B};\mathfrak{d}))\ll\frac{\epsilon^{-2}\exp(-\epsilon^{-1})\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\prod_{p|q^*}\Big(1-\frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big)^{-1},$$

and by Proposition 5.1 we have $|V_m(\mathcal{A};\mathfrak{d})-\lambda V_m(\mathcal{B};\mathfrak{d})|\ll\#\mathcal{A}(\log X)^{-10}$.

The contribution from $\mathfrak{d}$ with $\mathfrak{a}_3\le\mathfrak{d}$ and $N(\mathfrak{d})\le X^{1-k-\epsilon}$ can be handled by an identical argument, with $\mathfrak{a}_2$, $\mathfrak{a}_3$ instead chosen maximally such that $N(\mathfrak{a}_2)\le X^{2k+\epsilon}$ and $N(\mathfrak{a}_3)\le X^{n-k-\epsilon}$. This is because if $\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{p}_1\dots\mathfrak{p}_m}$ with $\mathfrak{a}_2<\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{p}_1\dots\mathfrak{p}_m\le\mathfrak{a}_3$ then $\mathfrak{a}=\mathfrak{a}_1\mathfrak{a}_2$ with $N(\mathfrak{a}_1)\in[X^{2k+\epsilon},X^{n-k-\epsilon}]$ so $N(\mathfrak{a}_2)\in[X^{k+\epsilon},X^{n-2k-\epsilon}]$, which means such sums can be handed by our Type II estimates.

The contribution from $\mathfrak{d}$ with $\mathfrak{a}_2<\mathfrak{d}\le\mathfrak{a}_3$ is negligible automatically by Proposition 5.1.This gives the result. □

We finish this section with a proof of Lemma 5.3.

Proof of Lemma 5.3. This is follows from the prime ideal theorem and a Polyá-Vinogradov-type inequality for $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]/q^*\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]$. For ease of notation, we let $q=q^*$. We let χ be the character on $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]/q\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]$ so that $\chi(\alpha)=\chi^*((\alpha))$. We may assume without loss of generality that χ is primitive, since otherwise the result follows by an analogous argument by splitting into residue classes $\pmod{q'}$ where

χ' (mod q') is the primitive character inducing χ. Finally we let ψ be the additive character of $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]/q\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]$ given by $\psi(\sum_{j=1}^n a_j \sqrt[n]{\theta^{j-1}}) = \exp(2\pi i a_n/q)$ and $\hat{\chi}$ be the Fourier transform of χ given by

$$\hat{\chi}(\beta) = \frac{1}{q^n} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]/q\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]} \chi(\gamma)\psi(\beta\gamma).$$

By Parseval's identity (using $\sum_\gamma \psi(\beta\gamma) = 0$ unless $\beta = 0 \in \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]/q\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]$), we have

$$\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]/q\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]} |\hat{\chi}(\alpha)|^2 = \frac{1}{q^n} \sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]/q\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]} |\chi(\beta)|^2 = 1.$$

Since χ is primitive, we have that $\hat{\chi}(\beta) = 0$ if $\beta \notin (\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]/q\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}])^\times$, whilst if $\beta \in (\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]/q\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}])^\times$ we have $\hat{\chi}(\beta) = \overline{\chi(\beta)}\hat{\chi}(1)$. Thus the magnitude of $\hat{\chi}$ is constant on $(\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]/q\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}])^\times$ and so $|\hat{\chi}(\beta)| \leq \phi_K((q))^{-1/2}$ for all β. (We recall that $\phi_K((q)) = \prod_{\mathfrak{p}|(q)}(N(\mathfrak{p})-1) = \#(\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]/q\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}])^\times$.)

We let $\alpha(\mathbf{a}_0) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} (\mathbf{a}_0)_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$. By orthogonality, we have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a}_0 \in [1,q]^{n-k}} \chi(\alpha(\mathbf{a}_0)) = \sum_{\beta \in (\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]/q\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}])^\times} \hat{\chi}(\beta) \sum_{\mathbf{a}_0 \in [1,q]^{n-k}} \psi(\beta\alpha(\mathbf{a}_0)).$$

Recalling our choice of ψ, we see that $\psi((\sum_{j=1}^n a_j \sqrt[n]{\theta^{j-1}})(\sum_{j=1}^n b_j \sqrt[n]{\theta^{j-1}}))$ is given by $\exp(2\pi i \sum_{j=1}^n a_j b_{n+1-j}/q)$. Thus

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a}_0 \in [1,q]^{n-k}} \chi(\alpha(\mathbf{a}_0)) = q^{n-k} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b} \in [1,q]^n \\ b_n = b_{n-1} = \cdots = b_{k+1} = 0}} \hat{\chi}(\beta). \tag{6.5}$$

The sum above is over q^k terms all of size at most $\phi_K((q))^{-1/2}$. Hence

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a}_0 \in [1,q]^{n-k}} \chi(\alpha(\mathbf{a}_0)) \leq \frac{q^n}{\phi_K((q))^{1/2}} \leq q^{n/2+o(1)}.$$

Since $n > 2k$ and $q \to \infty$, we see that the sum is $o(q^{n-k})$. We define the interval

$$\mathcal{I}_X = \Big[\frac{\log N_0^n}{\log X}, \frac{\log(N_0^n + \eta_1^{1/2} N_0^n)}{\log X}\Big].$$

Thus, by the prime ideal theorem and partial summation, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{a}_0\in[1,q]^{n-k}\\ \gcd(N_K(\mathbf{a}_0),q^*)=1}}\sum_{\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{a}_0)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{b})=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{N_0^n<N(\mathfrak{b})<N_0^n+\eta_1^{1/2}N_0^n}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{b})\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{a}_0\in[1,q]^{n-k}\\ \gcd(N_K(\mathbf{a}_0),q^*)=1}}(1+\chi^*(\mathfrak{a}_0))$$
$$=\frac{(1+o(1))q^{n-k}}{2}\prod_{p|q}\Big(1-\frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big)\sum_{N_0^n<N(\mathfrak{b})<N_0^n+\eta_1^{1/2}N_0^n}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{b})$$
$$=\frac{(1+o(1))q^{n-k}}{2}\prod_{p|q}\Big(1-\frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big)\int\limits_{\substack{(e_1,\dots,e_\ell)\in\mathcal{R}\\ \sum_{i=1}^\ell e_i\in\mathcal{I}_X}}\cdots\int\frac{X^{\sum_{i=1}^\ell e_i}de_1\dots de_\ell}{e_1\dots e_\ell}$$
$$=\frac{(1+o(1))\eta_1^{1/2}q^{n-k}N_0^n}{2\log X}\prod_{p|q}\Big(1-\frac{\nu(p)}{p^{n-k}}\Big)\int\limits_{\substack{(e_1,\dots,e_\ell)\in\mathcal{R}\\ \sum_{i=1}^\ell e_i=n}}\cdots\int\frac{de_1\dots de_{\ell-1}}{e_1\dots e_\ell}.$$

Here we used the fact that $\mathcal{R}$ is independent of X and $X^{\sum_{i=1}^\ell e_i}=(1+O(\eta_1^{1/2}))N_0^n$ for $(e_1,\dots,e_\ell)\in\mathcal{R}$ in the final line. □

Thus we are left to establish Proposition 5.1.

7. Type II Estimate: The L^1 Bounds

In this section we introduce an approximation $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}}\approx\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}$ in our Type II sums, and establish various L^1 estimates based on this. Much of this section is a generalization of the corresponding estimates of Heath-Brown [12].

We wish to show that

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{a})-\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\#\mathcal{B}}\sum_{\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{B}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{b})\ll\eta_1\#\mathcal{A},\tag{7.1}$$

where $\mathcal{R}\subseteq[\epsilon^2,n]^\ell$ is a polytope such that there is an $\ell_2\le\ell$ so that any $\mathbf{e}\in\mathcal{R}$ satisfies $k+\epsilon\le\sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2}e_i\le n-2k-\epsilon$. We recall that $\eta_1=(\log X)^{-100}$ and that

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{a})=\begin{cases}1, & \mathfrak{a}=\mathfrak{p}_1\dots\mathfrak{p}_\ell \text{ with } N(\mathfrak{p}_i)=X^{e_i},\ (e_1,\dots,e_\ell)\in\mathcal{R},\\ 0, & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases}$$
$$\mathcal{A}=\Big\{(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k}a_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}):X_i\le a_i\le X_i+\eta_1X_i,\ \sum_{i=1}^{n-k}a_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}\equiv\alpha_0\ (\mathrm{mod}\ q^*)\Big\},$$
$$\mathcal{B}=\{\mathfrak{a}:N(\mathfrak{a})\in[N_0^n,(1+\eta_1^{1/2})N_0^n],\ \chi^*(I)=\chi^*((\alpha_0))\},$$

with $N_0^n\ge\epsilon X^n$ the smallest norm of an ideal in $\mathcal{A}$. The quantity $\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}$ is as defined in the statement of Proposition 5.1.

We first split $\mathcal{R}$ into $O(\eta_1^{-\ell})$ hypercubes so that each of $e_1,\dots,e_\ell$ lie in intervals of side length η_1. Since $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathfrak{a})\ge0$, we may lower bound the sum over $\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A}$ by restricting to those hypercubes fully contained in $\mathcal{R}$, and upper bound by extending the summation to all elements of any hypercube intersecting $\mathcal{R}$. Since there are

$O(\eta_1^{-(\ell-1)})$ hypercubes $\mathcal{C}$ intersecting the boundary of $\mathcal{R}$, we have by the prime ideal theorem that this error is

$$\ll \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\#\mathcal{B}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{C} \\ \mathcal{C}\cap\mathcal{R}\neq 0,\, \mathcal{C}\not\subseteq\mathcal{R}}} \sum_{\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{B}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{b}) \ll \eta_1 \#\mathcal{A}.$$

Thus, to show (7.1), it suffices to show a bound $O(\eta_1^{\ell+1}\#\mathcal{A})$ when $\mathcal{R}$ is simply given by a direct product of intervals of length η_1 and for every $(e_1,\dots,e_\ell)\in\mathcal{R}$ we have $k+\epsilon/2 \le \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i \le n-2k-\epsilon/2$. In particular, it suffices to consider sums of the form

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a}_1,\mathfrak{a}_2 \\ \mathfrak{a}_1\mathfrak{a}_2\in\mathcal{A}}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a}_1)\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{a}_2) - \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\#\mathcal{B}} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a}_1,\mathfrak{a}_2 \\ \mathfrak{a}_1\mathfrak{a}_2\in\mathcal{B}}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a}_1)\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{a}_2),$$

where $\mathcal{R}_1\subseteq\mathbb{R}^{\ell_1}$, $\mathcal{R}_2\subseteq\mathbb{R}^{\ell_2}$ and each component of $\mathbf{e}\in\mathcal{R}_1\times\mathcal{R}_2$ lies in an interval of length η_1. Moreover, $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}$ is supported on ideals $\mathfrak{b}$ with $N(\mathfrak{b})\in[X^{k+\epsilon/2}, X^{n-2k-\epsilon/2}]$. Finally, it will be convenient to split the sum to localize the size of the norm of $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}$. By partial summation, we see it is therefore sufficient to show that uniformly over all $\epsilon X \le X_0 \ll X$ and over all such $\mathcal{R}_1,\mathcal{R}_2$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a}_1,\mathfrak{a}_2 \\ \mathfrak{a}_1\mathfrak{a}_2\in\mathcal{A}'}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a}_1)\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{a}_2) - \frac{\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}\#\mathcal{A}'}{\#\mathcal{B}'} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a}_1,\mathfrak{a}_2 \\ \mathfrak{a}_1\mathfrak{a}_2\in\mathcal{B}'}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a}_1)\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{a}_2) \ll \eta_2^{1/2}\#\mathcal{A}', \tag{7.2}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}' &= \{\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A} : N(\mathfrak{a})\in[X_0^n, X_0^n+\eta_2 X_0^n]\},\\ \mathcal{B}' &= \{\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{B} : N(\mathfrak{b})\in[X_0^n, X_0^n+\eta_2 X_0^n]\},\\ \eta_2 &= \eta_1^{2\ell+2}.\end{aligned}$$

We will establish this over the next two sections.

We first wish to replace $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})$ with a more easily controlled approximation $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})$. To do this we will take into account the possible effect of an exceptional character distorting the distribution of prime ideals in residue classes $\pmod{\mathfrak{q}}$, and so we recall the following results on zero-free regions for Hecke L-functions (see [17, Theorem 1.9], for example, for more details). This also makes precise the choice of q^*, χ^* in the definitions of $\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}$ which so far have been treated as arbitrary quantities.

There is at most one modulus $\mathfrak{q}^*$ with $N(\mathfrak{q}^*)\le\exp(\sqrt{\log x})$ and at most one primitive Hecke character χ^* of the narrow class group $\pmod{\mathfrak{q}^*}$ such that the Hecke L-function $L(s,\chi^*)$ has a zero in the region

$$\Big\{s=\sigma+it : \sigma\ge 1-\frac{c}{\sqrt{\log X(2+|t|)}}\Big\}.$$

This character, if it exists, must be a real quadratic character and the corresponding L-function has a unique real simple zero β^* in the above region. The modulus $\mathfrak{q}^*$ in this case must satisfy $q^*=N(\mathfrak{q}^*)>(\log X)^\epsilon$ and must be square-free apart from a factor of size $O(1)$. In particular, we have the prime number theorem with Grossencharacters that

$$\sum_{N(\mathfrak{a})\le X} \Lambda(\mathfrak{a})\chi(\mathfrak{a}) \ll X\exp(-c\sqrt{\log X}) \tag{7.3}$$

uniformly over all non-trivial Grossencharacters $\chi \neq \chi^*$ of conductor $\leq \exp(\sqrt{\log X})$ (including those with non-trivial infinity-type), whilst if $\chi = \chi^*$ we have

$$\sum_{N(\mathfrak{a})\leq X} \Lambda(\mathfrak{a})\chi(\mathfrak{a}) = \frac{-X^{\beta^*}}{\beta^*} + O(X\exp(-c\sqrt{\log X})). \tag{7.4}$$

With this established, we can now describe our approximation $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}$. If such a character χ^* does exist with corresponding modulus $N(\mathfrak{q}^*) \leq \exp(\sqrt[4]{\log X})$ then we define

$$\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}) = c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(N(\mathfrak{b}))\Big(1 + \frac{\chi^*(\mathfrak{b})}{(-\beta^*)^{\ell_2}N(\mathfrak{b})^{1-\beta^*}}\Big)\sum_{\mathfrak{d}|\mathfrak{b}}\lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}, \tag{7.5}$$

where

$$R = X^{\epsilon^2},$$
$$\lambda_{\mathfrak{d}} = \begin{cases} \mu(\mathfrak{d})\log\frac{R}{N(\mathfrak{d})}, & N(\mathfrak{d}) < R, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$
$$c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(t) = \int\cdots\int_{\substack{(e_1,\dots,e_{\ell_2})\in\mathcal{R}_2 \\ \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i = \log t/\log X}} \frac{de_1\dots de_{\ell_2-1}}{(\log X)\prod_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i}.$$

If χ^* does not exist or if $N(\mathfrak{q}^*) > \exp(\sqrt[4]{\log X})$ then we simply define

$$\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}) = c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(N(\mathfrak{b}))\sum_{\mathfrak{d}|\mathfrak{b}}\lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}.$$

We will argue in the first case when χ^* does exist; the argument entirely analogous in the alternative case but with all terms involving χ^*, β^* simply removed. The sum $\sum_{\mathfrak{d}|\mathfrak{b}}\lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}$ should be thought of as a sieve weight which approximates the indicator function of ideals with no prime ideal factors of norm less than R, whilst the other factor represents the density of $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}$ on ideals of norm approximately $N(\mathfrak{b})$.

Since all the e_i lie in intervals which are bounded uniformly away from 0, we have the Lipschitz bound

$$c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(t+\delta) - c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(t) \ll \frac{\delta}{t\log X}. \tag{7.6}$$

We will now proceed to show that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b} \\ \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{A}'}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}) = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b} \\ \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{B}'}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}) + O\Big(\eta_2^{1/2}\#\mathcal{A}'\Big), \tag{7.7}$$

so as to reduce the problem to showing $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}) \approx \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})$ for $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{A}'_{\mathfrak{a}}$, which we do by our L^2 estimate in the next section.

Lemma 7.1.

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b} \\ \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{B}'}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}) = \frac{(q^*)^n c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(X_0^n)\#\mathcal{B}'}{\phi_K((q^*))\gamma_K}\Big(1 + \frac{\chi^*(\mathfrak{a}_0)}{(-\beta^*)^{\ell}X_0^{n-n\beta^*}}\Big) + O(\eta_2^2 X_0^n).$$

Proof. We recall that $\mathcal{B}' = \{\mathfrak{a} : N(\mathfrak{a}) \in \mathcal{I}, \chi^*(\mathfrak{a}) = \chi^*(\mathfrak{a}_0)\}$, where $\mathcal{I}$ is the interval $[X_0^n, X_0^n + \eta_2 X_0^n]$. We have

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}\\ \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{B}'}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}\\ N(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b})\in\mathcal{I}}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})(1+\chi^*(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b})\chi^*(\mathfrak{a}_0)).$$

By the prime ideal theorem and partial summation we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}\\ N(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b})\in\mathcal{I}}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}) &= \int\cdots\int_{\substack{(e_1,\dots,e_\ell)\in\mathcal{R}_1\times\mathcal{R}_2\\ X^{\sum_{i=1}^\ell e_i}\in\mathcal{I}}} \frac{X^{\sum_{i=1}^\ell e_i} de_1\dots de_\ell}{\prod_{i=1}^\ell e_i} + O(\eta_2^2 X^n)\\ &= \log X\int_{X^t\in\mathcal{I}} X^t c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(X^t)dt + O(\eta_2^2 X^n).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using (7.4) we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}\\ N(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b})\in\mathcal{I}}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})\chi^*(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}) = \frac{\log X}{(-\beta^*)^\ell}\int_{X^t\in\mathcal{I}} X^{t\beta^*} c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(X^t)dt + O(\eta_2^2 X^n).$$

Let $s_0 = \log X_0^n/\log X$ and $\eta_0 = \log(1+\eta_2)/\log X \ll \eta_2/\log X$. Thus, by the bound (7.6) we have

$$\log X\int_{s_0}^{s_0+\eta_0} X^t c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(X^t)dt = \eta_2 X_0^n c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(X_0^n) + O(\eta_2^2 X_0^n),$$

$$\log X\int_{s_0}^{s_0+\eta_0} X^t c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(X^{t\beta^*})dt = \eta_2 X_0^{n\beta^*} c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(X_0^n) + O(\eta_2^2 X_0^n).$$

Since $\#\mathcal{B}' = \phi_K((q^*))\gamma_K\eta_2 X_0^n/2(q^*)^n + O(X^{n-1})$ this gives the result. □

Lemma 7.2. *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{d})<R\\ \gcd(N(\mathfrak{d}),q^*)=1}} \frac{\mu(\mathfrak{d})\rho(\mathfrak{d})}{N(\mathfrak{d})}\log\frac{R}{N(\mathfrak{d})} = \frac{(q^*)^n\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}}{\phi_K((q^*))\gamma_K} + O\Big(\exp(-c\sqrt{\log R})\Big).$$

Proof. By Perron's formula we have (noting that the integrals converge absolutely)

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{d})<R\\ \gcd(N(\mathfrak{d}),q^*)=1}} \frac{\mu(\mathfrak{d})\rho(\mathfrak{d})}{N(\mathfrak{d})}\log\frac{R}{N(\mathfrak{d})} &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{1-i\infty}^{1+i\infty}\frac{R^s}{s^2}\Big(\sum_{\mathfrak{d}}\frac{\mu(\mathfrak{d})\rho(\mathfrak{d})}{N(\mathfrak{d})^{1+s}}\Big)ds\\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{1-i\infty}^{1+i\infty}\frac{R^s}{s^2\zeta_K(1+s)}f(1+s)ds,\end{aligned} \tag{7.8}$$

where $f(s)$ is given by the Euler product

$$\begin{aligned}f(s) &= \prod_{p\nmid q^*}\Big(1+\sum_{N(\mathfrak{a})=p^j}\frac{\mu(\mathfrak{a})\rho(\mathfrak{a})}{N(\mathfrak{a})^s}\Big)\Big(1+\sum_{N(\mathfrak{a})=p^j}\frac{\mu(\mathfrak{a})}{N(\mathfrak{a})^s}\Big)^{-1}\prod_{\mathfrak{p}|(q^*)}\Big(1-\frac{1}{N(\mathfrak{p})^s}\Big)^{-1}\\ &= \prod_{p\nmid q^*}\Big(1-\frac{\nu_p}{p^s}+O(p^{-2\Re(s)})\Big)\Big(1-\frac{\nu_p}{p^s}+O(p^{-2\Re(s)})\Big)^{-1}\prod_{\mathfrak{p}|(q^*)}\Big(1-\frac{1}{N(\mathfrak{p})^s}\Big)^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Here we have made use of Lemma 6.5 to bound the $O()$ terms. In particular $f(1+s)$ converges absolutely for $\Re(s) \geq -1/4$. We first move the line of integration in

(7.8) to $\Re(s)=1/\log R$, and then truncate the integral to $[1-iT,1+iT]$ where $T=\exp(\sqrt{\log R})$. This truncation introduces an negligible error $O(\log T/T)$ by the bound $\zeta_K(1+1/\log R+it)^{-1}\ll \log(2+|t|)$ for $|t|\geq 1$. We then move the integration to $\Re(s)=-c/\log T$, where $c>0$ is a suitably small constant such that we have the bound $\zeta_K(s)\ll \log(2+|s|)$ within this region. This introduces a term from the pole at $s=0$, and an integral over the contour line $\Re(s)=-c/\log T$, which contributes $O(R^{-c/\log T})\ll \exp(-c\sqrt{\log R})$. Thus only the residue at $s=0$ makes a non-negligible contribution, and we have

$$\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{d})<R\\ \gcd(N(\mathfrak{d}),q^*)=1}}\frac{\mu(\mathfrak{d})\rho(\mathfrak{d})}{N(\mathfrak{d})}\log\frac{R}{N(\mathfrak{d})}=\operatorname*{Res}_{s=0}\frac{R^sf(1+s)}{s^2\zeta_K(1+s)}+O\Big(\exp(-c\sqrt{\log R})\Big)$$
$$=\gamma_K^{-1}f(1)+O\Big(\exp(-c\sqrt{\log R})\Big).$$

The result follows on noting that $f(1)=\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}(q^*)^n/\phi_K((q^*))$. □

Lemma 7.3.

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}\\ \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{A}'}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})=\frac{(q^*)^n\#\mathcal{A}'\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(X_0^n)}{\phi_K((q^*))\gamma_K}\Big(1+\frac{\chi^*(\mathfrak{a}_0)}{(-\beta^*)^\ell X_0^{n-n\beta^*}}\Big)+O\Big(\eta_2^{1/2}\#\mathcal{A}'\Big).$$

Proof. We substitute the definition (7.5) of $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})$ and swap the order of summation to give

(7.9)
$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}\\ \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{A}'}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})=\sum_{\mathfrak{a}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})\sum_{N(\mathfrak{d})<R}\lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{u}\in\mathcal{A}'\\ \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}|\mathfrak{u}}}c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(N(\frac{\mathfrak{u}}{\mathfrak{a}}))\Big(1+\frac{\chi^*(\mathfrak{u}/\mathfrak{a})}{(-\beta^*)^{\ell_2}N(\mathfrak{u}/\mathfrak{a})^{1-\beta^*}}\Big).$$

Since all ideals in $\mathcal{A}'$ have norm $X_0^n+O(\eta_2X_0^n)$ with $X_0^n\gg X^n$, we have that $c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(N(\mathfrak{u}/\mathfrak{a}))=c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(X_0^n/N(\mathfrak{a}))+O(\eta_2/\log X)$ by (7.6). We recall $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}$ is supported on ideals $\mathfrak{a}$ with $N(\mathfrak{a})<X^{n-k-\epsilon/2}$ and with all prime factors $\mathfrak{p}$ of $\mathfrak{a}$ satisfying $N(\mathfrak{p})\geq X^{\epsilon^2}=R$. Thus $\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{a}$ must be coprime if they make a contribution to the sum. We let $\mathfrak{e}=\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}$, and recall that $|\lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}|\ll\log X$. Putting this together, the error in replacing $c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(N(\mathfrak{u}/\mathfrak{a}))$ with $c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(X_0^n/N(\mathfrak{a}))$ contributes a total

$$\sum_{N(\mathfrak{e})<RX^{n-k-\epsilon/2}}\eta_2\#\mathcal{A}'_{\mathfrak{e}}\ll\eta_2\#\mathcal{A}'\sum_{N(\mathfrak{e})<RX^{n-2k-\epsilon/2}}\frac{\rho(\mathfrak{e})}{N(\mathfrak{e})}+X^{n-k-\epsilon/2n}$$

by Proposition 6.3. The sum here is $O(\log X)$ by an Euler product upper bound and Lemma 6.5, so the total error is $O(\eta_2^{1/2}\#\mathcal{A}')$. Similarly, we can replace $N(\mathfrak{u}/\mathfrak{a})^{1-\beta^*}$ in (7.9) with $X_0^{n-n\beta^*}/N(\mathfrak{a})^{1-\beta^*}$ at the cost of an error $O(\eta_2^{1/2}\#\mathcal{A}')$.

Since all elements $\mathfrak{u}$ of $\mathcal{A}'$ have $\chi^*(\mathfrak{u})=\chi^*(\mathfrak{a}_0)$, we are left to evaluate

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{a}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\frac{X_0^n}{N(\mathfrak{a})})\Big(1+\frac{\chi^*(\mathfrak{a})\chi^*(\mathfrak{a}_0)N(\mathfrak{a})^{1-\beta^*}}{(-\beta^*)^{\ell_2}X_0^{n-n\beta^*}}\Big)\sum_{N(\mathfrak{d})<R}\lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}\#\mathcal{A}'_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}}.$$

Since all elements of $\mathcal{A}'$ have norm coprime to q^*, we can restrict to $\gcd(N(\mathfrak{d}),q^*)=1$. Using Proposition 6.3, again, we may then replace $\#\mathcal{A}'_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}}$ with $\rho(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d})\#\mathcal{A}'/N(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d})$

at the cost of an error $O(X^{n-k-\epsilon/2n})$, which is negligible. Thus we are left to evaluate

$$\#\mathcal{A}'\sum_{\mathfrak{a}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})c_{\mathcal{R}_2}\Big(\frac{X_0^n}{N(\mathfrak{a})}\Big)\Big(1+\frac{\chi^*(\mathfrak{a})\chi^*(\mathfrak{a}_0)N(\mathfrak{a})^{1-\beta^*}}{(-\beta^*)^{\ell_2}X_0^{n-n\beta^*}}\Big)\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{d})<R\\ \gcd(N(\mathfrak{d}),q^*)=1}}\frac{\lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}\rho(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d})}{N(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d})}.$$

Again, any pairs $\mathfrak{a}$, $\mathfrak{d}$ making a contribution must be coprime since $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}$ is supported on ideals with all factors having norm at least R. Thus we may replace $\rho(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d})$ with $\rho(\mathfrak{d})\rho(\mathfrak{a})$, and so the double sum factorizes as

$$\Big(\sum_{\mathfrak{a}}\frac{\rho(\mathfrak{a})\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})}{N(\mathfrak{a})}c_{\mathcal{R}_2}\Big(\frac{X_0^n}{N(\mathfrak{a})}\Big)\Big(1+\frac{\chi^*(\mathfrak{a})\chi^*(\mathfrak{a}_0)N(\mathfrak{a})^{1-\beta^*}}{(-\beta^*)^{\ell_2}X_0^{n-n\beta^*}}\Big)\Big)\Big(\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{d})<R\\ \gcd(N(\mathfrak{d}),q^*)=1}}\frac{\lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}\rho(\mathfrak{d})}{N(\mathfrak{d})}\Big).$$

By Lemma 7.2 we have the second factor is $(q^*)^n\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}/\gamma_K\phi_K((q^*))+O(\exp(-c\sqrt{\log R}))$.

Since all degree 1 prime ideals have $\rho(\mathfrak{p})=1$, we see that $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})\rho(\mathfrak{a})=\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})$ unless $p^2|N(\mathfrak{a})$ for some $p>X^{\epsilon^2}$. Thus we can replace $\rho(\mathfrak{a})$ with the constant 1 in the first factor at the cost of an error

$$\ll\sum_{p>X^{\epsilon^2}}\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{a})<X^{n-k-\epsilon/2}\\ p^2|N(\mathfrak{a})}}\frac{\rho(\mathfrak{a})}{N(\mathfrak{a})}\ll\sum_{p>X^{\epsilon^2}}\frac{1}{p^2}\ll X^{-\epsilon^2},$$

by Lemma 6.5. This is negligible, and we can evaluate the resulting expressions by partial summation, the prime ideal theorem and (7.4). We have

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{a}}\frac{\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})}{N(\mathfrak{a})}c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\frac{X_0^n}{N(\mathfrak{a})})=\int\cdots\int_{\substack{(e_1,\dots,e_\ell)\in\mathcal{R}_1\times\mathcal{R}_2\\ \sum_{i=1}^\ell e_i=\log X_0/\log X}}\frac{de_1\dots de_{\ell-1}}{\log X\prod_{i=1}^\ell e_i}+O(\eta_2),$$

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{a}}\frac{\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})\chi^*(\mathfrak{a})}{N(\mathfrak{a})^{\beta^*}}c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\frac{X_0^n}{N(\mathfrak{a})})=\int\cdots\int_{\substack{(e_1,\dots,e_\ell)\in\mathcal{R}_1\times\mathcal{R}_2\\ \sum_{i=1}^\ell e_i=\log X_0/\log X}}\frac{de_1\dots de_{\ell-1}}{(-\beta^*)^{\ell_1}\log X\prod_{i=1}^\ell e_i}+O(\eta_2).$$

Combining these estimates gives the result. □

Combining Lemma 7.1 with Lemma 7.3 gives (7.7). We are therefore left to show that the error introduced by replacing $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}$ with $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}$ is suitably small. In particular, to establish (7.2), it is sufficient to show that

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{A}'}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})\Big(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})-\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})\Big)\ll\eta_2^{1/2}\#\mathcal{A}'.$$

We split the sum over $\mathfrak{b}$ into ideal classes $\mathcal{C}\in Cl_K$. We let $\mathfrak{c}$ be an ideal in $\mathcal{C}$, and $\mathfrak{c}'=(N(\mathfrak{c}))/\mathfrak{c}$. Then $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{c}'$ and $\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c}$ are both principle integral ideals, so can be written as (α), (β) say with $\mathfrak{c}'|(\alpha)$ and $\mathfrak{c}|(\beta)$. Thus, it suffices to show for any fixed $\mathfrak{c}$

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a},\,\mathfrak{b}\text{ principal}\\ \mathfrak{c}|\mathfrak{b},\,\mathfrak{c}'|\mathfrak{a}\\ \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}/N(\mathfrak{c})\in\mathcal{A}'}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{c}')\Big(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c})-\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c})\Big)\ll\eta_2^{1/2}\#\mathcal{A}'.\tag{7.10}$$

We begin by showing that $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c})\approx\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c})$ when $\mathfrak{b}$ is localized to a particular ideal class, residue mod q and angle of Hecke Grossencharacter.

Lemma 7.4. *Let us be given an ideal $\mathfrak{c}$ of norm $O(1)$. Let $\exp(-\epsilon\sqrt{\log B}) \le \delta_0 \le 1$ and $B \in [X^{1/10}, X^n]$. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a hypercube of side length $\delta_0 B$ which contains a point $\mathbf{b}_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $\|\mathbf{b}_0\| \ll B$ and $\mathfrak{b}_0 = ((\theta n)^{-n}\sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{b}_0)_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})$ is an integral ideal which satisfies $N(\mathfrak{b}_0) = B_0^n \gg B^n$ and $\mathfrak{c}|\mathfrak{b}_0$.*

Then uniformly over all $q \ll \exp(-c\sqrt{\log X})$ with $(\theta n)^n N(\mathfrak{c})|q$ and over all such $\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{b}_0$, we have:

- *If $\gcd((q), \mathfrak{b}_0) \neq \mathfrak{c}$ then*

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0 \pmod q}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\frac{\mathfrak{b}}{\mathfrak{c}}) = 0.$$

- *If $\gcd((q), \mathfrak{b}_0) = \mathfrak{c}$ and $\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}) = \chi^*(\mathfrak{b}_0/\mathfrak{c})$ for all $\mathbf{b} \equiv \mathbf{b}_0 \pmod q$ then*

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0 \pmod q}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\frac{\mathfrak{b}}{\mathfrak{c}}) = \frac{1}{\gamma_K\phi_K((q)/\mathfrak{c})N(\mathfrak{c})} \int_{\substack{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C},\mathbf{e}\in\mathcal{R}_2\\ \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i = \log N(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{c})/\log X}} \cdots \int \frac{de_1\dots de_{\ell_2-1}d\mathbf{a}}{\log X\prod_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i} + O(\delta_0^{n+1}B^n).$$
$$+ \frac{\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}_0\mathfrak{c})B_0^{n(\beta^*-1)}}{\gamma_K(-\beta^*)^{\ell_2}\phi_K((q)/\mathfrak{c})N(\mathfrak{c})^{\beta^*}} \int_{\substack{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C},\mathbf{e}\in\mathcal{R}_2\\ \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i = \log N(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{c})/\log X}} \cdots \int \frac{de_1\dots de_{\ell_2-1}d\mathbf{a}}{\log X\prod_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i}.$$

- *If $\gcd((q), \mathfrak{b}_0) = \mathfrak{c}$ but $\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}) \neq \chi^*(\mathfrak{b}_0/\mathfrak{c})$ for some $\mathbf{b} \equiv \mathbf{b}_0 \pmod q$ then*

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0 \pmod q}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\frac{\mathfrak{b}}{\mathfrak{c}}) = \frac{1}{\gamma_K\phi_K((q)/\mathfrak{c})N(\mathfrak{c})} \int_{\substack{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C},\mathbf{e}\in\mathcal{R}_2\\ \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i = \log N(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{c})/\log X}} \cdots \int \frac{de_1\dots de_{\ell_2-1}d\mathbf{a}}{\log X\prod_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i} + O(\delta_0^{n+1}B^n).$$

All the implied constants are effectively computable.

In the statement of the Lemma above, $\mathfrak{a}$ and $\mathfrak{b}$ denote the ideals $((\theta n)^{-n}\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})$ and $((\theta n)^{-n}\sum_{i=1}^n b_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})$ depending on the vectors $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{b}$ respectively.

Proof. We note that the sum is 0 if the ideal $\mathfrak{b}_0/\mathfrak{c}$ is not coprime to (q), since $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}$ is non-zero only when all prime ideal factors have norm at least $X^{\epsilon^2} > N(q)$, and this gives the first statement. We first detect the condition $\beta \in \mathcal{C}$ by Hecke Grossencharacters. We let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}$ be a basis of the torsion-free Hecke characters (i.e. those of pure infinity type), and define

$$W(\mathfrak{a};\mathfrak{b};\Delta) = \begin{cases} \prod_{j=1}^{n-1}\Big(1 - \frac{1}{2\pi\Delta}\arg\Big(\frac{\lambda_j(\mathfrak{a})}{\lambda_j(\mathfrak{b})}\Big)\Big), & \text{if } \arg\Big(\frac{\lambda_j(\mathfrak{a})}{\lambda_j(\mathfrak{b})}\Big) \le 2\pi\Delta\ \forall j,\\ 0, & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases}$$

$$= \Delta^{n-1}\sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}}\prod_{j=1}^{n-1}\frac{\lambda_j(\mathfrak{a})^{m_j}}{\lambda_j(\mathfrak{b})^{m_j}}\Big(\frac{\sin\pi m_j\Delta}{\pi m_j\Delta}\Big)^2 = \Delta^{n-1}\sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}}\frac{\chi^{\mathbf{m}}(\mathfrak{a})}{\chi^{\mathbf{m}}(\mathfrak{b})}\hat{w}(\mathbf{m}), \tag{7.11}$$

by Fourier expansion. Here $\arg(x) \in [0, 2\pi)$, $\chi^{\mathbf{m}}(\mathfrak{a}) = \prod_{j=1}^{n-1}\lambda_j^{m_j}(\mathfrak{a})$, $\hat{w}(\mathbf{m}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1}(\sin 2\pi m_j\Delta/2\pi m_j\Delta)^2$, and we take $\sin\pi m_j\Delta/\pi m_j\Delta$ to be 1 when $m_j = 0$.

We note that

(7.12)
$$\sum_{\substack{A\le N(\mathfrak{a})\le A+\Delta A\\ \mathfrak{a}\text{ principal}}} W(\mathfrak{a};\mathfrak{b};\Delta)=\frac{\Delta^{n-1}}{h_K}\sum_{\xi}\sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathbb{Z}^{n-1}}\chi^{\mathbf{m}}(\mathfrak{b})^{-1}\hat{w}(\mathbf{m})\sum_{A\le N(\mathfrak{a})\le A+\Delta A}\chi^{\mathbf{m}}(\mathfrak{a})\xi(\mathfrak{a}),$$

where ξ runs over all characters of the class group Cl_K.

Since $\hat{w}(\mathbf{m})\ll\prod_{j=1}^{n-1}\min(1,(m_j\Delta)^{-2})$, those terms with $m_j>M_0$ for some j contribute $O(A/M_0)$ in total to (7.12). If $\|\mathbf{m}\|\ll M_0<A^{\epsilon}$ and $\chi^{\mathbf{m}}\xi$ is non-trivial, then the inner sum is $O(A^{1-\epsilon})$ by Perron's formula and the bound $\zeta(s,\chi^{\mathbf{m}})\ll O(|s|+\|\mathbf{m}\|)^{n(1-\sigma)/2}$ (see [4, Theorem 1.2], for example), and so these terms contribute $O(\Delta^{n-1}M_0^{n-1}A^{1-\epsilon})$ in total to (7.12). Finally, the term with $\chi^{\mathbf{m}}\xi=1$ contributes $\gamma_K\Delta^nA(1+O(\Delta))/h_K$. Thus, choosing $M_0=\Delta^{-2n}$ and $\Delta=\delta_0^{2n}$, we see that for $A\ll B\ll A$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{A\le N(\mathfrak{a})\le A+\Delta A\\ \mathfrak{a}\text{ principal}}} W(\mathfrak{a};\mathfrak{b};\Delta)=\frac{\gamma_K\Delta^nA}{h_K}(1+O(\Delta)). \tag{7.13}$$

Given $\mathbf{b}\in\mathbb{Z}^n$, we let $\beta=(\theta n)^{-n}\sum_{i=1}^n b_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ and $\mathfrak{b}=(\beta)$. Since $\mathcal{C}$ has side length δ_0B, and $B^n\ll N(\mathfrak{b}_0)=B_0^n\ll B^n$ (from the assumptions of the Lemma), we have that $N(\mathfrak{b})=B_0^n+O(\delta_0B_0^n)$ for all $\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}$. By (7.13), choosing $A=N(\mathfrak{b})$, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0\pmod q}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c})=\frac{h_K}{\gamma_K\Delta^nB_0^n}\sum_{\mathfrak{a}\text{ principal}}\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ 1\le N(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{b})\le 1+\Delta\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0\pmod q}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c})W(\mathfrak{a};\mathfrak{b};\Delta)+O(\delta_0\operatorname{vol}C).$$

Here we used the fact that $\Delta=\delta_0^{2n}\le\delta_0$.

We now detect the condition $\mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0\pmod q$. We see that $\mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0\pmod q$ is equivalent to $\beta=(\theta n)^{-n}\sum_{i=1}^n b_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}\in\mathcal{O}_K$ and $\beta\equiv\beta_0'\pmod q$ for one of $[\mathcal{O}_K:(\theta n)^{-n}\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]]$ different algebraic integers β_0'. (Here we are using the fact that $(\theta n)^n|q$ and $\mathfrak{b}_0$ is integral.) We consider each such β_0' separately, and detect $\beta\equiv\beta_0'\pmod q$ by characters χ_q of the multiplicative group $(\mathcal{O}_K/\sim)^\times$, where $\alpha\sim\beta$ if $\beta_0'(\alpha-\beta)\equiv0\pmod q$. We note that $\#(\mathcal{O}_K/\sim)^\times=\phi_K((q)/\mathfrak{c})$ since $\gcd((q),\mathfrak{b}_0)=\mathfrak{c}$. These characters χ_q are not a characters of ideals, and so we first transform the sum into a suitable sum over ideals.

We can write $\tilde{\chi_q}(\mathfrak{b})=\chi_q(\beta)\exp(\sum_\sigma u_{\sigma,\chi}\log|\beta^\sigma|)\prod_\sigma(\beta^\sigma/|\beta^\sigma|)^{v_{\sigma,\chi}}$ for a unique character $\tilde{\chi}_q$ on ideals mod $\mathfrak{m}=(q)/\mathfrak{c}$ which is trivial on the group of fractional ideals coprime to $\mathfrak{m}$ modulo principal fractional ideals coprime to $\mathfrak{m}$, and for some constants $u_{\sigma,\chi},v_{\sigma,\chi}\ll1$ for each embedding $\sigma:K\to\mathbb{C}$. This is because $u_{\sigma,\chi},v_{\sigma,\chi}$ can be chosen such that the above expression is invariant under multiplication by units, and so gives rise to a well defined character on principal ideals coprime to $\mathfrak{m}$. If $W(\mathfrak{a};\mathfrak{b};\Delta)\neq0$, then there is a generator α of $\mathfrak{a}$ such that $\lambda_j(\alpha)=\lambda_j(\beta)(1+O(\Delta))$ for each j. Thus, since $N(\mathfrak{a})=N(\mathfrak{b})(1+O(\Delta))$, this means that $\alpha^\sigma=\beta^\sigma(1+O(\Delta))$ for all σ, and so $\alpha=(\theta n)^{-n}\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ for some vector $\mathbf{a}=\mathbf{b}+O(\Delta B)$ with $\mathbf{a}\in\mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $\alpha\in\mathcal{O}_K$. In particular, since log is continuous, $\chi_q(\beta)\tilde{\chi}_q(\mathfrak{a})=$

$\tilde{\chi}_q(\mathfrak{b})\chi_q(\alpha)(1+O(\Delta))$. This error term $O(\Delta)$ contributes

$$\ll \frac{h_K}{\gamma_K \Delta^n B_0^n} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}} \sum_{\mathbf{a}=\mathbf{b}+O(\Delta B)} \Delta \ll \Delta \operatorname{vol}\mathcal{C} \ll \delta_0^{n+1} B^n.$$

If the distance from $\mathbf{a}$ to the boundary of $\mathcal{C}$ is a sufficiently large multiple of ΔB, then all $\mathbf{b}$ with $W(\mathfrak{a};\mathfrak{b};\Delta)\neq 0$ are either outside of $\mathcal{C}$ or inside $\mathcal{C}$. Since there are $O(\Delta B^n)$ vectors $\mathbf{a}$ within $O(\Delta B)$ of the boundary of $\mathcal{C}$, these $\mathbf{a}$ contribute a total

$$\ll \frac{h_K \Delta B^n}{\gamma_K \Delta^n B_0^n} \sup_{\|\mathbf{a}\|\ll B} \sum_{\mathbf{b}=\mathbf{a}+O(\Delta B)} 1 \ll \Delta B^n \ll \delta_0^{n+1} B^n.$$

Thus we can restrict to $\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C}'$, a hypercube inside $\mathcal{C}$ with all points at least a certain multiple of ΔB from the boundary of $\mathcal{C}$. Finally, we note that since $\Delta = o(1)$, $\mathcal{C}$ is contained within a fundamental domain of the action of the group of units, and so the vector $\mathbf{a}$ is uniquely determined by $\mathfrak{a}$. We are then left to evaluate

(7.14)
$$\frac{h_K}{\gamma_K \Delta^n B_0^n} \sum_{\beta_0'} \sum_{\chi_q} \frac{\overline{\chi_q(\beta_0')}}{\#(\mathcal{O}_K/\sim)^\times} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C}'\\ \alpha\in\mathcal{O}_K}} \frac{\chi_q(\mathfrak{a})}{\tilde{\chi}_q(\mathfrak{a})} \sum_{\substack{1\le N(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{b})\le 1+\Delta\\ \mathfrak{b}\text{ principal}}} \tilde{\chi}_q(\mathfrak{b})\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}) W(\mathfrak{a};\mathfrak{b};\Delta).$$

We use characters ξ of the class group Cl_K to detect the condition that $\mathfrak{b}$ is principal, and insert the Fourier expansion (7.11) of W. By partial summation and (7.3), we have that if $\chi^{\mathbf{m}}$ and ξ are non-trivial, or if $\tilde{\chi}_q$ is non-trivial and not induced by χ^*, then there is a constant $c_0>0$ such that

$$\sum_{N(\mathfrak{a})/(1+\Delta)\le N(\mathfrak{b})\le N(\mathfrak{a})} \tilde{\chi}_q(\mathfrak{b})\chi^{\mathbf{m}}(\mathfrak{b})\xi(\mathfrak{b})\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}) \ll B^n \exp(-c_0\sqrt{\log B})$$

uniformly for q, $\|\mathbf{m}\|\le \exp(\sqrt{\log B})$.

This implies that the total contribution to (7.14) from all such characters $\chi^{\mathbf{m}}\xi$ with $\|\mathbf{m}\|\ll M_0$ is $\ll \Delta^{-1}B^n M_0^{n-1}\exp(-c_0\sqrt{\log B})$. As before, using the trivial bound $\hat{w}(\mathbf{m})\ll \prod_j \min(1,(m_j\delta)^{-2})$ those characters with $\|\mathbf{m}\|\ge M_0$ contribute $O(\Delta^{-n}B^n M_0^{-1})$. Recalling $M_0=\Delta^{-2n}$ and $\Delta=\delta_0^{2n}$, these all contribute $O(\Delta^{1/2}B^n)\ll \delta_0^{n+1}B^n$. We are therefore left only with the contribution from when both ξ and $\chi^{\mathbf{m}}$ are trivial, and $\tilde{\chi}_q$ is either the trivial character χ_0, or is the quadratic character induced by χ^*. $\tilde{\chi}_q$ can only be induced by χ^* if $\mathfrak{q}^*|(q)/\mathfrak{c}$. We argue now in the case when $\mathfrak{q}^*|(q)/\mathfrak{c}$; the case $\mathfrak{q}^*\nmid (q)/\mathfrak{c}$ is entirely analogous with all terms involving χ^* simply being omitted. Since $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}$ is supported only on ideals coprime to q (because $q<X^{\epsilon^2}$), if $\tilde{\chi}_q$ is induced by χ^* then we can replace $\tilde{\chi}_q$ with χ^*. In these cases we obtain by partial summation and the prime ideal theorem or

(7.4) respectively

$$\sum_{N(\mathfrak{a})/(1+\Delta)\le N(\mathfrak{b})\le N(\mathfrak{a})} \chi_0(\mathfrak{b})\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}) = \int\limits_{\mathbf{e}\in\mathcal{R}_2\cap\mathcal{I}_\mathfrak{a}}\cdots\int \frac{X^{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i} de_1\dots de_{\ell_2}}{\prod_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i} + O(B^n \exp(-c_0\sqrt{\log B})),$$

$$\sum_{N(\mathfrak{a})/(1+\Delta)\le N(\mathfrak{b})\le N(\mathfrak{a})} \chi^*(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c})\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}) = \int\limits_{\mathbf{e}\in\mathcal{R}_2\cap\mathcal{I}_\mathfrak{a}}\cdots\int \frac{X^{\beta^*\sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i} de_1\dots de_{\ell_2}}{(-\beta^*)^{\ell_2}\prod_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i} + O(B^n \exp(-c_0\sqrt{\log B})),$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}_\mathfrak{a} = \{\mathbf{e}\in\mathbb{R}^{\ell_2} : \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{c})}{(1+\Delta)\log X} \le \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i \le \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{c})}{\log X}\}.$$

Finally, we note that given a character ψ on ideals $\pmod q$, the characters χ_q such that $\tilde{\chi}_q = \psi$ are precisely those of the form $\chi_q(\alpha) = \psi((\alpha))\phi(\alpha)$, for some character ϕ of the unit group $(U_K/\sim)^\times$. Putting this all together, we have

$$\sum_{\chi_q}\overline{\chi_q(\beta_0')}\sum_{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C}'}\frac{\chi_q(\mathfrak{a})}{\tilde{\chi}_q(\mathfrak{a})}\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{a})/(1+\Delta)\le N(\mathfrak{b})\le N(\mathfrak{a})\\ \mathfrak{b}\text{ principal}}}\tilde{\chi}_q(\mathfrak{b})\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c})W(\mathfrak{a};\mathfrak{b};\Delta)$$

$$= \frac{\Delta^{n-1}}{h_K}\sum_{\phi}\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C}'\\ \alpha\in\mathcal{O}_K}}\phi(\alpha)\overline{\phi(\beta_0')}\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{a})/(1+\Delta)\le N(\mathfrak{b})\\ N(\mathfrak{b})\le N(\mathfrak{a})}}\Big(1+\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c})\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}_0'\mathfrak{c})\Big)\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}) + O(\delta_0^{n+1}B^n)$$

$$= \frac{\Delta^{n-1}}{h_K}\sum_{\phi}\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C}'\\ \alpha\in\mathcal{O}_K}}\phi(\alpha)\overline{\phi(\beta_0')}\int\limits_{\mathbf{e}\in\mathcal{R}_2\cap\mathcal{I}_\mathfrak{a}}\cdots\int\frac{X^{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i} de_1\dots de_{\ell_2}}{\prod_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i}$$
$$+ \frac{\Delta^{n-1}}{h_K}\sum_{\phi}\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C}'\\ \alpha\in\mathcal{O}_K}}\phi(\alpha)\overline{\phi(\beta_0')}\frac{\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}_0'\mathfrak{c})}{(-\beta^*)^{\ell_2}}\int\limits_{\mathbf{e}\in\mathcal{R}_2\cap\mathcal{I}_\mathfrak{a}}\cdots\int\frac{X^{\beta^*\sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i} de_1\dots de_{\ell_2}}{\prod_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i} + O(\delta_0^{n+1}B^n).$$

Since $\mathcal{C}'$ is equidistributed in residue classes mod q (up to a negligible error $O(B^{n-1})$), and the summand is a continuous function of $N(\mathfrak{a})$, only the trivial character ϕ on $(U_K/\sim)^\times$ makes a noticeable contribution. Thus this is equal to

$$\frac{\Delta^{n-1}}{h_K}\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C}'\\ \alpha\in\mathcal{O}_K}}\int\limits_{\mathbf{e}\in\mathcal{R}_2\cap\mathcal{I}_\mathfrak{a}}\cdots\int\frac{X^{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i} de_1\dots de_{\ell_2}}{\prod_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i}$$
$$+ \frac{\Delta^{n-1}}{h_K}\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C}'\\ \alpha\in\mathcal{O}_K}}\frac{\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}_0'\mathfrak{c})}{(-\beta^*)^{\ell_2}}\int\limits_{\mathbf{e}\in\mathcal{R}_2\cap\mathcal{I}_\mathfrak{a}}\cdots\int\frac{X^{\beta^*\sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i} de_1\dots de_{\ell_2}}{\prod_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i} + O(\delta_0^{n+1}B^n).$$

The condition $\alpha\in\mathcal{O}_K$ is equivalent to a congruence condition on $\mathbf{a}$ $\pmod{(\theta n)^n}$ which holds for a proportion $r_K = [\mathcal{O}_K : (\theta n)^{-n}\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]]^{-1}$ of the vectors $\mathbf{a}$ in a cube

of side length $(\theta n)^n$. Thus, by partial summation we see that this is equal to

$$\frac{\Delta^{n-1}r_K}{h_K}\int\limits_{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C}',\,\mathbf{e}\in\mathcal{R}_2\cap\mathcal{I}_{\mathfrak{a}}}\cdots\int\frac{X^{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2}e_i}de_1\dots de_{\ell_2}}{\prod_{i=1}^{\ell_2}e_i}d\mathbf{a}$$
$$+\frac{\Delta^{n-1}r_K\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}_0'\mathfrak{c})}{h_K(-\beta^*)^{\ell_2}}\int\limits_{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C}',\,\mathbf{e}\in\mathcal{R}_2\cap\mathcal{I}_{\mathfrak{a}}}\cdots\int\frac{X^{\beta^*\sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2}e_i}de_1\dots de_{\ell_2}}{\prod_{i=1}^{\ell_2}e_i}d\mathbf{a}+O(\delta_0^{n+1}B^n).$$

Using the fact that $X^{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2}e_i}=(1+O(\Delta))B_0^n/N(\mathfrak{c})$ and the bound (7.6) we see that this is equal to

$$\Big(\frac{\Delta^n r_K B_0^n}{h_K N(\mathfrak{c})}+\frac{\Delta^n r_K B_0^{n\beta^*}\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}_0\mathfrak{c})}{(-\beta^*)^{\ell_2}h_K N(\mathfrak{c})^{\beta^*}}\Big)\int_{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C}'}c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(N(\mathfrak{a}))d\mathbf{a}+O(\delta_0^{n+1}B^n).$$

Thus, multiplying by $h_K/(\gamma_K\Delta^n B_0^n\#(\mathcal{O}_K/\sim)^\times)$ we have shown that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \beta\equiv\beta_0'\pmod q}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\frac{\mathfrak{b}}{\mathfrak{c}})=\frac{r_K}{\gamma_K\phi_K((q)/\mathfrak{c})N(\mathfrak{c})}\int_{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C}'}c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(N(\mathfrak{a}))d\mathbf{a}+O(\delta_0^{n+1}B^n)$$
$$+\frac{r_K\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}_0'\mathfrak{c})}{\gamma_K(-\beta^*)^{\ell_2}\phi_K((q)/\mathfrak{c})N(\mathfrak{c})^{\beta^*}B_0^{n-n\beta^*}}\int_{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C}'}c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(N(\mathfrak{a}))d\mathbf{a}.$$

We now sum over the r_K^{-1} values of β_0'. (We recall these are the elements of $\mathcal{O}_K/q\mathcal{O}_K$ of the form $\beta_0'=(\theta n)^{-n}\sum_{i=1}^n(\mathbf{b}_0')_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ with $\mathbf{b}_0'\equiv\mathbf{b}_0\pmod q$.) We see that the terms involving $\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}_0')$ cancel unless all $\mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0\pmod q$ have $\chi^*(\mathfrak{b})=\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}_0)$ since χ^* is primitive. The rest of the expression is independent of the β_0'. Thus, if $\chi^*(\mathfrak{b})=\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}_0)$ for all $\mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0\pmod q$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0\pmod q}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\frac{\mathfrak{b}}{\mathfrak{c}})=\frac{1}{\gamma_K\phi_K((q)/\mathfrak{c})N(\mathfrak{c})}\int_{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C}'}c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(N(\mathfrak{a}))d\mathbf{a}+O(\delta_0^{n+1}B^n)$$
$$+\frac{\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}_0\mathfrak{c})}{\gamma_K(-\beta^*)^{\ell_2}\phi_K((q)/\mathfrak{c})N(\mathfrak{c})^{\beta^*}B_0^{n-n\beta^*}}\int_{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C}'}c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(N(\mathfrak{a}))d\mathbf{a},$$

and if χ^* is not constant then we have the same expression with the second term removed.

Finally, extending the integration over $\mathbf{a}$ from $\mathcal{C}'$ to $\mathcal{C}$ introduces an error of size $O(\Delta B^n)$, since the integrand is of size $O(1)$ and this increases the volume of the region of integration by $O(\Delta B^n)$. This then gives the result. □

Lemma 7.5. *Let $\mathfrak{c},\delta_0,B,\mathcal{C},\mathbf{b}_0$ be as in Lemma 7.4. Then uniformly over all $q\ll\exp(\sqrt{\log B})$ with $N(\mathfrak{c})|q$ and over all such $\mathcal{C},\mathbf{b}_0$ we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0\pmod q}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\sum_{i=1}^n b_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})=\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0\pmod q}}\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\sum_{i=1}^n b_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})+O(\delta_0^{n+1/2}B^n).$$

The implied constant is effectively computable.

Proof. We first consider a similar sum to the one in the Lemma. Letting $Q' = \operatorname{lcm}(N(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}), Q^n)$ and spliting into residue classes $\pmod{Q'}$, we have that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0 \pmod{Q^n}\\ \mathfrak{d}|\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}}} 1 = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{a} \pmod{Q'}\\ \mathbf{a}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0 \pmod{Q^n}\\ \mathfrak{d}|\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{c}}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{a} \pmod{Q'}}} 1.$$

The outer sum has no terms unless $\gcd(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}, (Q))|\mathfrak{b}_0$, in which case there are there are $N(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c})^{n-1}/\gcd(N(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}), Q^n)^{n-1}$ terms in the outer sum. The inner sum is $(\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{C})/Q'^n + O(\delta_0^{n-1}B^{n-1})$. Thus, provided $\gcd(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}, (Q))|\mathfrak{b}_0$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0 \pmod{Q^n}\\ \mathfrak{d}|\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}}} 1 = \frac{\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{C}}{N((Q))^{n-1}\operatorname{lcm}(N((Q)), N(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}))} + O(BN(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}))^{n-1}. \tag{7.15}$$

In particular, since $B > X^{1/10}$ and $\operatorname{vol} C \gg B^{n-\epsilon}$, this is $O(\operatorname{vol} C/N(\mathfrak{d}))$ for $N(\mathfrak{d}) < R$.

We now consider the sum in the Lemma, but work with residue classes $\mathbf{b}_0' \pmod{q^n}$ instead of $\pmod{q}$. Substituting the definition (7.5) of $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}$ and swapping the order of summation, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0' \pmod{q^n}}} \tilde{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}) = \sum_{N(\mathfrak{d})<R} \lambda_{\mathfrak{d}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0' \pmod{q^n}\\ \mathfrak{d}|\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}}} c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(N(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}))\Big(1 + \frac{\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c})}{(-\beta^*)^{\ell_2}N(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c})^{1-\beta^*}}\Big).$$

Since $\mathcal{C}$ is a hypercube of side length $\delta_0 B$, and contains an element of norm $B_0^n \gg B^n$, all elements of $\mathcal{C}$ have norm $B_0^n + O(\delta_0 B^n)$. Thus, by the Lipschitz bound (7.6), we can replace $c_{\mathcal{R}_2}(N(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}))$ with

$$\frac{1}{\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{C}} \int_{\substack{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{e}\in\mathcal{R}_2\\ \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i = \log N(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{c})/\log X}} \cdots \int \frac{de_1 \dots de_{\ell_2-1} d\mathbf{a}}{\log X \prod_{i=1}^{\ell_2} e_i}$$

at the cost of an error of size

$$\ll \sum_{N(\mathfrak{d})<R} \log X \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0' \pmod{q^n}\\ \mathfrak{d}|\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}}} \delta_0 \ll \sum_{N(\mathfrak{d})<R} \frac{\delta_0 \operatorname{vol}\mathcal{C} \log X}{N(\mathfrak{d})} \ll \delta_0^{1/2} \operatorname{vol}\mathcal{C}.$$

Similarly, we can replace $N(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c})$ with $N(\mathfrak{b}_0/\mathfrak{c})$ at the cost of an error $O(\delta_0^{1/2} \operatorname{vol}\mathcal{C})$. Thus we are left to evaluate

$$\sum_{N(\mathfrak{d})<R} \lambda_{\mathfrak{d}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0' \pmod{q^n}\\ \mathfrak{d}|\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}}} 1 + \frac{1}{(-\beta^*)^{\ell_2}N(\mathfrak{b}_0/\mathfrak{c})^{1-\beta^*}} \sum_{N(\mathfrak{d})<R} \lambda_{\mathfrak{d}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0' \pmod{q^n}\\ \mathfrak{d}|\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}}} \chi^*(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}).$$

We concentrate on the second term. We have that $\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}) = 0$ if $\gcd(\mathfrak{q}^*, \mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}) \neq 1$, and so there are no contributions from terms with $\gcd(\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{q}^*) \neq 1$. By splitting the

sum into residue classes $\pmod{Q'}$ where $Q'=\operatorname{lcm}(N(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{q}^*),q^n)$, we see that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0' \pmod{q^n}\\ \mathfrak{d}|\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}}}\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c})=\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{a} \pmod{Q'}\\ \mathbf{a}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0' \pmod{q^n}\\ \mathfrak{d}|\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{c}}}\chi^*(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{c})\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{a} \pmod{Q'}}}1.$$

As with (7.15), the inner sum is $\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{C}/Q'^n+O(\delta_0^{n-1}B^{n-1})$, and this error term makes a negligible total contribution. The remaining sum of $\chi^*(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{c})$ is then seen to cancel cancel completely unless $\chi^*(\mathfrak{b})=\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}_0')$ for all $\mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0'\pmod{q^n}$ since χ^* is primitive. If this is the case, then by (7.15) we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0' \pmod{q^n}\\ \mathfrak{d}|\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}}}\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c})=\frac{\chi^*(\mathfrak{b}_0'/\mathfrak{c})\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{C}}{N((q))^{n-1}\operatorname{lcm}(N((q)),N(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}))}+O(B^{n-1}R^{n-1}),$$

and otherwise the sum is simply $O(B^{n-1}R^{n-1})$. These $O(B^{n-1}R^{n-1})$ error terms make a negligible contribution. Regardless of whether χ^* is constant or not, we see that the main term differs from the main term of (7.15) by a factor independent of $\mathfrak{d}$. Thus, since there are $q^{n^2-n}=N((q))^{n-1}$ choices of $\mathbf{b}_0'\pmod{q^n}$ such that $\mathbf{b}_0'\equiv\mathbf{b}_0\pmod q$, we are left to show that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{d}<R\\ \gcd(\mathfrak{d},(q)/\mathfrak{c})|\mathfrak{b}_0/\mathfrak{c}}}\frac{\lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}}{\operatorname{lcm}(N(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}),N((q)))}=\frac{1}{\gamma_K\phi_K((q)/\mathfrak{c})N(\mathfrak{c})}+O(\delta_0). \tag{7.16}$$

We estimate this in an analogous way to Lemma 7.2. We let $(q)=\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{q}_1\mathfrak{q}_2$, with $\gcd(\mathfrak{q}_2,\mathfrak{b}_0/\mathfrak{c})=1$ and $\mathfrak{q}_1$ composed only of primes which divide $\mathfrak{b}_0/\mathfrak{c}$. Since $\lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}=0$ if $\mathfrak{d}$ is not square-free, we may replace the condition $\gcd(\mathfrak{d},(q)/\mathfrak{c})|\mathfrak{b}_0/\mathfrak{c}$ with $\gcd(\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{q}_2)=1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{N(\mathfrak{d})<R\\ \gcd(\mathfrak{q}_2,\mathfrak{d})=1}}\frac{\mu(\mathfrak{d})\log\frac{R}{N(\mathfrak{d})}}{\operatorname{lcm}(N(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}),N(\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{q}_1\mathfrak{q}_2))}&=\frac{1}{2\pi iN(\mathfrak{q}_2\mathfrak{c})}\int_{1-i\infty}^{1+i\infty}\frac{R^sg(1+s)}{s^2\zeta_K(1+s)}ds\\ &=\frac{1}{N(\mathfrak{q}_2\mathfrak{c})}\operatorname*{Res}_{s=0}\frac{R^sg(1+s)}{s^2\zeta_K(1+s)}+O\Big(\exp(-c\sqrt{\log R})\Big),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$g(1+s)=\prod_{\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{q}_1}\frac{N(\mathfrak{p})^{-1}-N(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-s}}{1-N(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-s}}\prod_{\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{q}_2}\frac{1}{1-N(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-s}}.$$

We see that the residue is 0 if $\mathfrak{q}_1\neq(1)$, whereas if $\mathfrak{q}_1=(1)$ (so $\gcd(\mathfrak{b}_0,q)=\mathfrak{c}$) the residue is $\gamma_K^{-1}N(\mathfrak{q}_2)/\phi_K(\mathfrak{q}_2)$. This then gives (7.16), and hence the result. □

8. Some lattice estimates

In this section we collect some information about the structure of ideals $\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{a}}'$, before we finishing our Type II estimate in the next section. It is here we exploit some of the simple structure from the fact $K=\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt[n]{\theta})$.

If $\mathfrak{a}=(\alpha)$ is principal, then $\mathfrak{b}\in\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{a}}'$ if $\mathfrak{b}=(\beta)$ with $(\beta\alpha)=(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k}x_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})$ for some $\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{Z}^n$ with $x_i\in[X_i,X_i+\eta_1X_i]$ for $1\leq i\leq n-k$ and $x_i=0$ for $n-k<i\leq n$ and $\mathbf{x}\equiv\mathbf{x}_0\pmod{q^*}$ and $N(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k}x_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})\in[X_0^n,X_0^n+\eta_2X_0^n]$.

Since $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]$ is an order in $\mathcal{O}_K$ of finite index dividing $(\theta n)^n$, any principal ideal $\mathfrak{b}$ has a unique representation as (β) with $\beta = (\theta n)^{-n}\sum_{i=1}^n b_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \cap \mathcal{F}$ for a fundamental domain $\mathcal{F}$ by the action of the group of units $\mathcal{U}_K$, with $\mathbf{b}$ satisfying some linear congruence conditions $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{b}) \equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod{(\theta n)^n}$. We have

$$\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n b_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}\Big)\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}\Big) = \Big(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}\Big)$$

with

$$c_j = \Big(\sum_{i=1}^j b_{j-i+1}a_i + \theta\sum_{i=j+1}^n b_{n+j-i+1}a_i\Big) = T^{n-j}(\overleftarrow{\mathbf{b}})\cdot\mathbf{a},$$

where $\cdot$ is the usual Euclidean dot product on $\mathbb{R}^n$, $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{v}}$ indicates the reverse of the coordinates of $\mathbf{v}$ (i.e. $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{v}}_j = \mathbf{v}_{n+1-j}$) and T^i indicates the i^{th} iterate of the linear map T given by

$$T(\mathbf{v})_j = \begin{cases} v_{j+1}, & j < n, \\ \theta v_1, & j = n. \end{cases}$$

We let $\diamond$ denote the above operation, so that $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{b}\diamond\mathbf{a}$.

Thus, there is a bijection between pairs of principal ideals $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}$ with $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}/N(\mathfrak{c}) \in \mathcal{A}'$, and vectors $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \cap \mathcal{F}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ (for any choice of fundamental domain $\mathcal{F}$) with $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{a}) \equiv \mathbf{L}(\mathbf{b}) \equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod{(\theta n)^n}$ and with $\mathbf{a}\diamond\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{R}_X$, where $\mathcal{R}_X$ is given by

$$\mathcal{R}_X = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_i \in [X_i', X_i' + \eta_1 X_i'] \text{ for } i \le n-k,\ x_i = 0 \text{ for } i > n-k,$$
$$N_K(\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}) \in [X_0'^n, X_0'^n + \eta_2 X_0'^n]\}. \tag{8.1}$$

Here $X_i' = (\theta n)^2 N(\mathfrak{c}) X_i$, which still satisfy $X \ll X_i' \ll X$. We see that, given $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, the conditions $(\mathbf{b}\diamond\mathbf{a})_j = 0$ force $\mathbf{b}$ to satisfy k linear equations, and hence lie in a sublattice of $\mathbb{Z}^n$. With this in mind, we define the lattices

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_{\mathbf{v}} &= \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : (\mathbf{x}\diamond\mathbf{v})_i = 0,\ n-k < i \le n\} \\ &= \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \mathbf{x}\cdot T^i(\overleftarrow{\mathbf{v}}) = 0,\ 0 \le i \le k-1\}, \\ \Lambda_{\mathbf{v}_1,\mathbf{v}_2} &= \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : (\mathbf{x}\diamond\mathbf{v}_1)_i = (\mathbf{x}\diamond\mathbf{v}_2)_i = 0,\ n-k < i \le n\} \\ &= \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \mathbf{x}\cdot T^i(\overleftarrow{\mathbf{v}_1}) = \mathbf{x}\cdot T^i(\overleftarrow{\mathbf{v}_2}) = 0,\ 0 \le i \le k-1\}.\end{aligned}$$

We first establish some basic properties of these lattices.

Lemma 8.1. *Let $\mathbf{v}$, $\mathbf{v}_1$, $\mathbf{v}_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^n\backslash\{\mathbf{0}\}$. Let $\wedge(\mathbf{v}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{\binom{n}{k}}$ be the vector of determinants of $k\times k$ submatrices of the $k\times n$ matrix formed by the k vectors $T^0(\mathbf{v}),\dots,T^{k-1}(\mathbf{v})$. Similarly, let $\wedge(\mathbf{v}_1,\mathbf{v}_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^{\binom{n}{2k}}$ be the vector of determinants of the $2k\times 2k$ submatrices of the $2k\times n$ matrix formed of the $2k$ vectors $T^0(\mathbf{v}_1),\dots,T^{k-1}(\mathbf{v}_1)$ and $T^0(\mathbf{v}_2),\dots,T^{k-1}(\mathbf{v}_2)$. Finally, let $D_{\mathbf{v}}$ be the largest integer D such that $\wedge(\mathbf{v}) \equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod{D}$, and $D_{\mathbf{v}_1,\mathbf{v}_2}$ be the largest integer D' such that $\wedge(\mathbf{v}_1,\mathbf{v}_2) \equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod{D'}$. Then we have*

$$\det(\Lambda_{\mathbf{v}}) = \frac{\|\wedge(\mathbf{v})\|}{D_{\mathbf{v}}},$$
$$\det(\Lambda_{\mathbf{v}_1,\mathbf{v}_2}) = \frac{\|\wedge(\mathbf{v}_1,\mathbf{v}_2)\|}{D_{\mathbf{v}_1,\mathbf{v}_2}} \quad \text{if } \wedge(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2) \neq \mathbf{0}.$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r$ be linearly independent vectors in $\mathbb{Z}^n$, and let $\Lambda = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 = \cdots = \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{v}_r = 0\}$. By [11, Lemma 1], $\det \Lambda = \det \Lambda^*$ where $\Lambda^* = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^r c_i \mathbf{v}_i,\ c_i \in \mathbb{Q}\}$.

Let $D(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r)$ be the largest integer such that the determinant of all $r \times r$ submatrices of the $n \times r$ matrix formed with columns $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r$ vanish mod $D(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r)$. We define an reduction procedure on a set of vectors. Given $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_r\} \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^r$ with $D(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_r) \neq 1$ we choose (arbitrarily) a prime $p | D(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_r)$. By definition of $D(\cdot)$, this means that there are constants $c_1, \dots, c_r$ at least one of which is 1, such that $\sum_{i=1}^r c_i \mathbf{x}_i \equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod p$. We choose (arbitrarily) an index j such that $c_j = 1$ and replace $\mathbf{x}_j$ with $\sum_{i=1}^r c_i \mathbf{x}_i / p \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ to produce a new set of vectors $(\mathbf{x}_1', \dots, \mathbf{x}_r')$, and we see that we must have $D(\mathbf{x}_1', \dots, \mathbf{x}_r') = D(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_r)/p$. By starting with $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r\}$ and repeatedly performing this reduction we arrive at a basis $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_r$ for Λ^*. (This process clearly terminates as $D(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_r)$ decreases at each stage, and the resulting set is a basis since $D(\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_r) = 1$.) Moreover, we see the $\mathbb{Z}$-span of $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r$ is a lattice $\tilde{\Lambda}$ which is an index $D(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r)$ sublattice of Λ^*.

Thus $\det \Lambda = \det \Lambda^* = \det \tilde{\Lambda} / D(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r)$. But $\det \tilde{\Lambda}$ is simply the volume of the r-dimensional fundamental volume of $\tilde{\Lambda}$. If $e_{r+1}, \dots, e_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are orthonormal vectors orthogonal to $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r$, then $\det \tilde{\Lambda}$ is given by the determinant of the $n \times n$ matrix with columns $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r, \mathbf{e}_{r+1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$. This is then seen to be the L^2 norm of the exterior product of $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r$, (that is, the vector of all determinants of the $r \times r$ submatrices of the $r \times n$ matrix with columns $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r$) since both quantities are independent of a choice of orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and agree on the orthonormal basis $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n\}$ extending $\mathbf{e}_{r+1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$.

Applying the above argument to $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k\} = \{T^0(\mathbf{v}), \dots, T^{k-1}(\mathbf{v})\}$ gives the result for $\Lambda_{\mathbf{v}}$, whilst using $\{T^0(\mathbf{v}_1), \dots, T^{k-1}(\mathbf{v}_1), T^0(\mathbf{v}_2), \dots, T^{k-1}(\mathbf{v}_2)\}$ gives the result for $\Lambda_{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2}$. □

Lemma 8.2. *Let $n > 3k$. Then, given $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \backslash \{\mathbf{0}\}$, let $\mathcal{L}$ be a linear subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\wedge(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{L}$. Then $\mathcal{L}$ has dimension at most k.*

Proof. If $\wedge(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{0}$, then there exists constants $c_0, \dots, c_{k-1}, d_0, \dots, d_{k-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ not all zero such that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} c_i T^i(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} d_i T^i(\mathbf{b}).$$

Since $\mathbf{b} \neq 0$, we have that $N(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} b_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}) = \det(\{T^i(\mathbf{b})\}_{i=0}^{n-1}) \neq 0$, so $\{T^i(\mathbf{b})\}_{i=0}^{n-1}$ are linearly independent vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Thus we cannot have $c_0 = \cdots = c_{k-1} = 0$ and we can write $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} x_i T^i(\mathbf{b})$. With respect to this basis, the above equation implies that $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} c_i x_{j-i} = 0$ for each $k \leq j < n$. Since the $c_0, \dots, c_{k-1}$ are not all zero we let c_ℓ be the first non-zero element, so we have $x_j = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1-\ell} c_{\ell+i}' x_{j-i}$ with $c_i' = c_i / c_\ell$. We now restrict our argument to the case when $c_0, c_{k-1} \neq 0$; the other cases follow by an analogous argument.

The equation $x_j = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} c_i' x_{j-i}$ is a difference equation, so $x_j = \sum_i P_i(j) \lambda_i^j$ for some polynomials $P_1, \dots, P_\ell$ with $\sum_i \deg(P_i) \leq k-1$ and some constants λ_i in

a finite extension of $\mathbb{R}$. We will show that in any linear space $\mathcal{L}$, at most $k-1$ different monomials $j\lambda_i^j$ can appear in such an expression.

Assume the contrary for a contradiction. Thus there exists $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{L}$ with $(\mathbf{x})_j = \sum_i P_i(j)\lambda_i^j$ and $(\mathbf{y})_j = \sum_m Q_m(j)\mu_m^j$, for $1 < j \le n$, with at least k different monomials $j^{m_1}\lambda_{m_2}^j$, $j^{m_1}\mu_{m_2}^j$ appearing with non-zero coefficients in these expressions. Then there is a suitable linear combination $a_1\mathbf{x} + a_2\mathbf{y}$ such that at least k different monomials appear. But $a_1\mathbf{x} + a_2\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{L}$, so $a_1\mathbf{x} + a_2\mathbf{y}$ can also be written as $\sum_i T_i(j)\gamma_i^j$ with at most $k-1$ different monomials $j^{m_1}\gamma_{m_2}^j$ appearing. But then we have $\sum_i T_i(j)\gamma_i^j = a_1\sum_i P_i(j)\lambda_i^j + a_2\sum_i Q_i(j)\mu_i^j$, so the monomials $j^{m_1}\gamma_{m_2}^j, j^{m_1}\mu_{m_2}^j, j^{m_1}\lambda_{m_2}^j$ satisfy a non-zero linear equation $\sum_i e_i M_i(j) = 0$ for all $1 < j \le n$, for some constants e_i not all zero and distinct monomials $M_i(j)$ of the form $j^{m_1}\gamma_{m_2}^j, j^{m_1}\mu_{m_2}^j$ or $j^{m_1}\lambda_{m_2}^j$ (for some integers m_1, m_2). Moreover, since there are at most $k-1$ monomials from each of $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{y}$ and $a_1\mathbf{x} + a_2\mathbf{y}$, there are at most $3k-3$ monomials appearing in this expression. In matrix form, this equation is

$$\begin{pmatrix} M_1(2) & \dots & M_{3k-3}(2) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ M_1(n) & \dots & M_{3k-3}(n) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e_1 \\ \vdots \\ e_{3k-3} \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{0}.$$

Since $n > 3k$ the first $3k-3$ rows form a $(3k-3)\times(3k-3)$ generalized Vandermonde matrix, whose determinant vanishes only if two of the monomials are the same. (If the monomials are $j^m\lambda_i^j$ for $m \le m_i$ and $i \le r$ then the determinant has absolute value $(\prod_{i=1}^r \prod_{m=1}^{m_i-1} m!)(\prod_{i=1}^r \lambda_i^{m_i(m_i+1)/2})(\prod_{1\le i<j\le r}(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^{m_i m_j})$ by essentially the same argument as the standard Vandermonde determinant evaluation; we leave the details to the reader.) Thus the vector $(e_1, \dots, e_{3k-3})$ must be zero, a contradiction to our assumption that it is non-zero. Thus only $k-1$ different monomials can appear, and so $\mathcal{L}$ has dimension at most k (since x_0 is a free variable). □

Remark. *The bound in Lemma 8.2 is tight, since the subspace generated by the vectors $T^0(\mathbf{b}), \dots, T^{k-1}(\mathbf{b})$ has dimension k.*

Lemma 8.3. *Let $n > 3k$. Let $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$ have successive minima $Z_1 \le \dots \le Z_{n-k}$. Then $\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$ has a $\mathbf{Z}$-basis $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{n-k}$ such that*

- *For each $i \in \{1, \dots, n-k\}$ we have $Z_i \ll \|\mathbf{z}_i\| \ll Z_i$.*
- *$\wedge(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_{k+1}) \ne \mathbf{0}$.*
- *For any $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-k} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$, $\|\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} \lambda_i \mathbf{z}_i\| \gg \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} \|\lambda_i \mathbf{z}_i\|$*

Proof. It is a classical fact in the theory of lattices (see [2], for example) that if $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{n-k}$ are the successively shortest linearly independent vectors in $\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$, then these form a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of $\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$ with $\|\mathbf{z}_i\| = Z_i$ and $\|\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} \lambda_i \mathbf{z}_i\| \gg \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} \|\lambda_i \mathbf{z}_i\|$. The space generated by $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{k+1}$ is a linear space of dimension $k+1$, so by Lemma 8.2 we have that $\wedge(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_1)$ does not vanish for all $\mathbf{x}$ in this space. But since $\wedge(\cdot, \mathbf{z}_1) = \mathbf{0}$ is given by the vanishing of a system of homogeneous polynomials of degree $O(1)$, this means that there is a non-zero homogeneous polynomial $f \in \mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_{k+1}]$ of degree $O(1)$ such that $\wedge(\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \lambda_i \mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{z}_1) = \mathbf{0}$ only if $f(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{k+1}) = 0$. But there is then a choice of $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{k+1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\lambda_{k+1} = 1$ and $\lambda_i \ll 1$ for all $1 \le i \le k$ such that $f(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{k+1}) \ne 0$. It is then easy to verify that replacing $\mathbf{z}_{k+1}$ with $\mathbf{z}'_{k+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \lambda_i \mathbf{z}_i$ gives a basis with the required properties. □

9. Type II Estimate: The L^2 bound

In this section we use the Linnik dispersion method and estimates from the geometry of numbers and elementary algebraic geometry to finish our Type II estimate. It is this section which involves the key new ideas behind our proof. We recall from (7.10) that we wish to show that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b} \text{ principal}\\ \mathfrak{c}|\mathfrak{b},\, \mathfrak{c}'|\mathfrak{a}\\ \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}/N(\mathfrak{c})\in\mathcal{A}'}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{c}')(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c})-\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}))\ll \eta_2^{1/2}\#\mathcal{A}'.$$

Here we recall that $\eta_2\gg (\log X)^{-O(1)}$ and

$$\mathcal{A}'=\{\mathfrak{a}\in\mathcal{A}: N(\mathfrak{a})\in[X_0^n, X_0^n+\eta_2 X_0^n]\}.$$

From the discussion at the beginning of Section 8, $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}/N(\mathfrak{c})\in\mathcal{A}'$ for principal $\mathfrak{a}$, $\mathfrak{b}$ is equivalent to $\mathfrak{a}=((\theta n)^{-n}\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})$ and $\mathfrak{b}=((\theta n)^{-n}\sum_{i=1}^n b_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})$ for some $\mathbf{a}\in\mathbb{Z}^n\cap\mathcal{F}$, $\mathbf{b}\in\mathbb{Z}^n$ with $\mathbf{a}\diamond\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{R}_X$ satisfying some congruence condition $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})\equiv\mathbf{0}\pmod{(\theta n)^n}$, for any choice of fundamental domain $\mathcal{F}$ of the action of the group of units U_K. Here we recall from (8.1) that

$$\mathcal{R}_X=\{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n: x_i\in[X_i', X_i'+\eta_1X_i'] \text{ for } i\le n-k,\ x_i=0 \text{ for } i>n-k,\\ N(\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})\in[X_0'^n, X_0'^n+\eta_2X_0'^n]\}.$$

We recall that if $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a})\neq 0$ then $N(\mathfrak{a})\in[A,2A]$ for some quantity A, and if $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}/N(\mathfrak{c})\in\mathcal{A}'$ also then $N(\mathfrak{b})\in[B,2B]$ for some quantity B with $X^{k+\epsilon/2}\le B\le X^{n-2k-\epsilon/2}$ and $X\ll AB\ll X$.

Any element $\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{R}_X\cap\mathbb{Z}^n$ has $\|\mathbf{x}\|\ll X$, and so $\gamma=\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ has $|\gamma^\sigma|\ll X$ for all embeddings σ. Since $N(\gamma)\gg X^n$, this implies $|\gamma^\sigma|\gg X$ for all σ as well. We may choose a suitable fundamental domain $\mathcal{F}$ such that the vector $\mathbf{a}$ satisfies $\|\mathbf{a}\|\ll A$. This implies that $\alpha=(\theta n)^{-n}\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ has $|\alpha^\sigma|\ll A$ for all embeddings σ, and so any $\beta=\gamma/\alpha$ will then satisfy $|\beta^\sigma|\ll B$ for all σ. Thus this choice of $\mathcal{F}$ allows us to restrict to $a_i\ll A$ and $b_i\ll B$ for all $1\le i\le n$.

Thus, splitting $\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}$ into residue classes mod $\tilde{q}=(\theta n)^n q^* N(\mathfrak{c})$, recalling that $q^*\le\exp(\sqrt[4]{\log X})$ and letting $\epsilon_0=\exp(-\sqrt[3]{\log X})$, it is sufficient to show that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{a}\in\mathbb{Z}^n\cap\mathcal{F}\\ \|\mathbf{a}\|\ll A\\ \mathbf{a}\equiv\mathbf{a}_0 \pmod{\tilde{q}}}}\ \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0 \pmod{\tilde{q}}\\ \mathbf{a}\diamond\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{R}_X}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{c}')(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c})-\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}))\ll \epsilon_0^{1/2}A^{n-k}B^{n-k} \tag{9.1}$$

for any $\mathbf{a}_0,\mathbf{b}_0$. Here we have used the fact that since $q^*=N(\mathfrak{q}^*)<\exp(\sqrt[4]{\log X})$, we have $\epsilon_0^{1/2}(\tilde{q})^{2n}X^{n-k}\ll\eta_2^{1/2}\#\mathcal{A}'$.

We first establish a small lemma to enable our initial manipulations.

Lemma 9.1. *Let $e>0$. We have*

$$\sum_{\substack{\|\mathbf{x}\|\ll X\\ x_j=0 \text{ if } j>n-k}}\tau\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k}x_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}\Big)^e\ll X^{n-k}(\log X)^{O_e(1)}.$$

Proof. By, [12, Lemma 4.4], given any integer $m > 0$, an ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ has an ideal factor $\mathfrak{b}|\mathfrak{a}$ with $N(\mathfrak{b}) \le N(\mathfrak{a})^{1/m}$ and $\tau(\mathfrak{a}) \le 2^{m-1}\tau(\mathfrak{b})^{2m-1}$. Thus, taking $m = n^2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{\|\mathbf{x}\|\ll X\\ x_j=0 \text{ if } j>n-k}} \tau\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} x_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}\Big)^e &\ll \sum_{N(\mathfrak{d})<X^{1/n}} \tau(\mathfrak{d})^{2en^2} \sum_{\substack{\|\mathbf{x}\|\ll X\\ x_j=0 \text{ if } j>n-k\\ \mathfrak{d}|(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} x_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})}} 1\\ &\ll \sum_{N(\mathfrak{d})\ll X^{1/n}} \tau(\mathfrak{d})^{2en^2}\rho(\mathfrak{d})N(\mathfrak{d})^{n-k-1}\Big(\frac{X^{n-k}}{N(\mathfrak{d})^{n-k}} + O(X^{n-k-1})\Big)\\ &\ll X^{n-k}\sum_{N(\mathfrak{d})<X^{n/3}} \frac{\tau(\mathfrak{d})^{6e}\rho(\mathfrak{d})}{N(\mathfrak{d})}.\end{aligned}$$

But the sum over $\mathfrak{d}$ is then bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{N(\mathfrak{p})\le X^{1/n}}\Big(1+\frac{2^{6e}\rho(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})}+O\Big(\frac{1}{N(\mathfrak{p})^2}\Big)\Big) &\ll \prod_{p<X^{n/3}}\Big(1+\frac{2^{6e}\nu_p n}{p}+O\Big(\frac{1}{p^2}\Big)\Big)\\ &\ll (\log X)^{O_e(1)},\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 6.5. □

To sidestep some minor issues associated to $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}$ occasionally being large if $\tau(\mathfrak{b})$ is large, we introduce a quantity $g_{\mathbf{b}}$, defined by

$$g_{\mathbf{b}} = \begin{cases}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}) - \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}), & \tau(\mathfrak{b}) \le \epsilon_0^{-2},\\ 0, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

We now replace $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}) - \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c})$ with $g_{\mathbf{b}}$. Since $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}) - \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{c}) \ll \tau(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} b_i \sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}})\log X$, the error introduced by this change is

$$\begin{aligned}O\Big(\sum_{\mathbf{a}\ll A}\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}\\ \|\mathbf{b}\|\ll B\\ \tau(\mathfrak{b})>\epsilon_0^{-2}}} \tau(\mathfrak{b})\log X\Big) &\ll \sum_{\|\mathbf{a}\|\ll A}\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}\\ \|\mathbf{b}\|\ll B}} \epsilon_0^2\tau(\mathfrak{b})^2\log X\\ &\ll \sum_{\substack{\|\mathbf{x}\|\ll X\\ x_j=0 \text{ if } j>n-k}} \epsilon_0^2\tau\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} x_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}\Big)^2\\ &\ll \epsilon_0^2 X^{n-k}(\log X)^{O(1)},\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 9.1. Since $\epsilon_0 = \exp(-\sqrt[3]{\log X})$, this is $O(\epsilon_0 X^{n-k})$ and so negligible. Thus, in order to show (9.1), it is sufficient to show

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{a}\in\mathbb{Z}^n\cap\mathcal{F}\\ \|\mathbf{a}\|\in[A,2A]\\ \mathbf{a}\equiv\mathbf{a}_0 \pmod{\tilde{q}}}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0 \pmod{\tilde{q}}\\ \mathbf{a}\diamond\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{R}_X}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{c}')g_{\mathbf{b}} \ll \epsilon_0^{1/2}A^{n-k}B^{n-k}. \tag{9.2}$$

By Cauchy-Schwartz (dropping the constraint $\mathbf{a}\equiv\mathbf{a}_0 \pmod{\tilde{q}}$, and upper bounding $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{c}')$ by 1) we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{a}\in\mathbb{Z}^n\cap\mathcal{F}\\ \|\mathbf{a}\|\in[A,2A]\\ \mathbf{a}\equiv\mathbf{a}_0 \pmod{\tilde{q}}}}\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0 \pmod{\tilde{q}}\\ \mathbf{a}\diamond\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{R}_X}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_1}(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{c}')g_{\mathbf{b}}$$
$$\ll\Big(\sum_{\|\mathbf{a}\|\ll A}1\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\sum_{\|\mathbf{a}\|\in[A,2A]}\Big|\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}\\ \mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{b}_0 \pmod{\tilde{q}}\\ \mathbf{a}\diamond\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{R}_X}}g_{\mathbf{b}}\Big|^2\Big)^{1/2}.$$

The first sum in parentheses is $O(A^n)$, so it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{\substack{\|\mathbf{b}_1\|,\|\mathbf{b}_2\|\in[B,2B]\\ \mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2\equiv\mathbf{b}_0 \pmod{\tilde{q}}}}g_{\mathbf{b}_1}\overline{g_{\mathbf{b}_2}}\sum_{\mathbf{a}\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}\cap\mathcal{R}_A}1\ll\epsilon_0^2A^{n-2k}B^{2n-2k},\tag{9.3}$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_A=\{\mathbf{a}\in\mathbb{R}^n:\|\mathbf{a}\|\in[A,2A],\,\mathbf{a}\diamond\mathbf{b}_1\in\mathcal{R}_X,\,\mathbf{a}\diamond\mathbf{b}_2\in\mathcal{R}_X\}.$$

If $\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\neq\mathbf{0}$, then $\Lambda_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}$ is a rank $n-2k$ lattice, and we expect the inner sum to typically be (using Lemma 8.1)

$$\approx\frac{\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}_A}{\det\Lambda_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}}=\frac{D_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}_A}{\|\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\|}\approx\frac{cA^{n-2k}}{B^{2k}}$$

for some suitable constant $c=c_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}$ of size ≈ 1 which varies continuously and slowly with $\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2$. The first approximation can fail if $\Lambda_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}$ is highly skewed, whilst the second approximation can fail if $\Lambda_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}$ has an unusually small determinant. $\Lambda_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}$ can have small determinant either for Archimdean reasons (if $\|\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\|$ is small) or for non-Archimeadan reasons (if $D_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}$ is large). To deal with these issues, we show for most $\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2$ these complications do not occur.

Remark. *Usually one would introduce a smooth weight on the sum over* $\mathbf{a}$ *to allow for simpler or more precise analysis of the resulting inner sum. We have deliberately chosen not to smooth here because we wish to emphasize the elementary nature of the estimates we use from the geometry of numbers. In principal smoothing would allow one to use exponential sums to widen the Type II ranges, but the author has not been able to get suitable control over the resulting exponential sums.*

Remark. *The diagonal terms* $\mathbf{b}_1=\mathbf{b}_2$ *contribute* $A^{n-k}B^{n-k+o(1)}$ *to the overall sum, and so we require* $A^k<B^{n-k+o(1)}$. *If we do not show cancellations in the error terms for the inner sum over* $\mathbf{a}$ *above, then we can only hope to gain an asymptotic if* $A^{n-2k}>B^{2k}$ *(but see the remark below). Together these conditions force* $X^k<B<X^{n-2k}$, *and our Type II estimate applies in essentially the full range. Similar restrictions apply to any other sequence of density* $1-k/n$, *which is why the initial work on Diophantine approximation by primes had equivalent restrictions on the Type II range.*

Remark. *We can obtain slightly more flexibility in our Type II estimates by restricting* $\mathbf{b}$ *to lie in a residue class* $\pmod{Q}$ *for a suitably sized modulus* Q *before applying Cauchy-Schwarz. This has the effect of increasing the contribution from the diagonal terms, but enabling us to estimate the off-diagonal terms in a wider range. This has the potential to give an asymptotic formula for primes represented by an incomplete norm form of* $\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]$ *in the wider range* $n>(2+\sqrt{2})k$. *In the*

interests of brevity and clarity, we will not consider this further here, but we intend to address this in a future paper.

9.1. **Archimedean estimates.** We first consider complications when the lattice $\Lambda_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}$ is skewed or has small determinant because $\| \wedge (\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2)\|$ is small.

Lemma 9.2. *Let $f(x) = f_d x_1^d + f_{d-1}x^{d-1} + \cdots + f_0 \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ with $f_d \neq 0$. $D/(D, f_d) = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} p_i^{e_i}$. Then we have*

$$\#\Big\{ n \in [1, y] : f(n) \equiv 0 \pmod{D},\ |f(n)| \leq B \Big\} \leq d\tau_d(D)\Big(1 + \min\Big(y, \frac{B^{1/d}}{|f_d|^{1/d}}\Big)\frac{1}{D'}\Big),$$

where $D' = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} p_i^{\lceil e_i/d \rceil} > D^{1/d}/(D, f_d)^{1/d}$.

Proof. Let $\tilde{D} = D/(D, f_d)$. Let f have (non necessarily distinct) roots $\alpha_{p,1}, \ldots, \alpha_{p,d}$ in a suitable finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}_p$, and let $\| \cdot \|_p$ be the extension of the norm on $\mathbb{Q}_p$. Similarly, let f have roots $\alpha_{\infty,1}, \ldots, \alpha_{\infty,d}$ over $\mathbb{C}$. If $f(n) \equiv 0 \pmod{D}$ then $\prod_{i=1}^{d} \|n - \alpha_{p,i}\|_p \leq \|\tilde{D}\|_p$ for all primes $p|\tilde{D}$, so certainly there exists a root $\alpha^{(p)}$ for each $p|\tilde{D}$ such that $\|n - \alpha^{(p)}\|_p \leq \|D'\|_p$ on recalling the definition of D'. Similarly, if $|f(n)| \leq B$ then certainly there is a root $\alpha^{(\infty)}$ such that $|n - \alpha^{(\infty)}| \leq (B/|f_d|)^{1/d}$.

Let us be given a root $\alpha^{(\infty)}$ over $\mathbb{C}$, and a root $\alpha^{(p)}$ over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p$ for each prime $p|\tilde{D}$. Then integers n which satisfy $\|n - \alpha^{(p)}\|_p \leq \|D'\|_p$ for each $p|D'$ are simply integers in a single residue class modulo D' (by the Chinese remainder theorem), and those with $|n - \alpha^{(\infty)}| < (B/|f_d|)^{1/d}$ and $n \in [1, y]$ are integers in an interval of length $\min(y, (B/|f_d|)^{1/d})$. Thus there at most $1 + \min(y, (B/|f_d|)^{1/d})/D'$ integers $n \leq y$ which satisfy $\|a - \alpha^{(p)}\|_p \leq \|D'\|_p$ for each $p|D'$ and $|n - \alpha^{(\infty)}| \leq (B/|f_d|)^{1/d}$. But there are at most d choices of $\alpha^{(\infty)}$, and at most $\tau_d(\tilde{D})$ possible choices of roots $\alpha^{(p)}$, so there are at most $d\tau_d(\tilde{D})(1 + \min(y, B^{1/d}|f_d|^{-1/d})/D')$ integers $n \leq y$ such that $f(n) \equiv 0 \pmod{D}$ and $|f(n)| \leq B$. □

Lemma 9.3. *Let $n > 3k$. Let $\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$ have successive minima $Z_1 \leq \cdots \leq Z_{n-k}$ and a basis $\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_{n-k}$ with $Z_i \ll \|\mathbf{z}_i\| \ll Z_i$. Let $\ell \leq 2k$ be such that $\kappa_2 = \| \wedge (\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_\ell)\| Z_1^{-k} Z_\ell^{-k} > 0$. Assume that $Z_1 Z_\ell \ll BC$. Finally, let*

$$S_{\mathbf{a}}(B, C; \kappa) = \#\Big\{ \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}} : \|\mathbf{b}\| \leq B, \|\mathbf{c}\| \leq C, \| \wedge (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})\| \leq \kappa B^k C^k \Big\}.$$

Then we have

$$S_{\mathbf{a}}(B, C; \kappa) \ll \Big(\frac{Z_1}{B} + \frac{Z_1 Z_\ell}{BC} + \min\Big(1, \Big(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_2}\Big)^{1/k}\Big)\frac{Z_1}{Z_\ell}\Big)\frac{Z_\ell^\ell}{\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} Z_i}\Big(\frac{BC}{Z_1 Z_\ell}\Big)^{n-k} \log BC.$$

Proof. By symmetry we may assume without loss of generality that $B \leq C$. We may further assume that $Z_1 \ll B$ since otherwise there are no vectors $\mathbf{b} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$ with $\|\mathbf{b}\| \leq B$ and so $S_{\mathbf{a}}(B, C; \kappa) = 0$.

By assumptions of the Lemma, we can write $\mathbf{b} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} b_i \mathbf{z}_i$, $\mathbf{c} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} c_i \mathbf{z}_i$ with $b_i \ll B/Z_i$ and $c_i \ll C/Z_i$. Since $\wedge(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_\ell) \neq \mathbf{0}$, we have that $\| \wedge (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})\|^2$ is given by a polynomial of degree $4k$ in the coefficients b_i, c_i, which is a polynomial of degree

$2k$ in the b_i and degree $2k$ in the c_i. Since the coefficient of $b_1^{2k}c_\ell^{2k}$ is $\|\wedge(\mathbf{z}_1,\mathbf{z}_\ell)\|^2$, we have that this polynomial takes the form

$$b_1^{2k}(c_\ell^{2k}\|\wedge(\mathbf{z}_1,\mathbf{z}_\ell)\|^2+f_2)+f_3,$$

where f_2 is a polynomial independent of b_1 and degree at most $2k-1$ in c_ℓ, and f_3 is a polynomial of degree at most $2k-1$ in c_1.

Let us be given a choice of $b_2,\dots,b_{n-k},c_1,\dots,c_{\ell-1},c_{\ell+1},\dots,c_{n-k}$ and a quantity $U=2^j\ll C^{2k}B^{2k}$. By Lemma 9.2 there are $O(1+U^{1/2k}\|\wedge(\mathbf{z}_1,\mathbf{z}_\ell)\|^{-1/k})$ possible values of c_ℓ such that $c_\ell^{2k}\|\wedge(\mathbf{z}_1,\mathbf{z}_\ell)\|^2+f_2\in[U,2U]$. Here the implied constant does not depend on our choice of the other b_i,c_i or on U. For each such choice of c_ℓ there are $O(1+\kappa^{1/k}BCU^{-1/2k})$ possible choices of b_1 such that $\|\wedge(\mathbf{b},\mathbf{c})\|^2\ll\kappa^2B^{2k}C^{2k}$ by Lemma 9.2 again. Thus, combining these bounds with the trivial bounds B/Z_1 and $1+C/Z_\ell$ for the number of choices of b_1 and c_ℓ, we find that there are

$$\ll 1+\frac{B}{Z_1}+\frac{C}{Z_\ell}+\frac{\kappa^{1/k}BC}{\|\wedge(\mathbf{z}_1,\mathbf{z}_\ell)\|^{1/k}}\ll\frac{B}{Z_1}+\frac{C}{Z_\ell}+\frac{\kappa^{1/k}BC}{\kappa_2^{1/k}Z_1Z_\ell}$$

possible choices of b_1,c_ℓ for this value of U. Since this bound does not depend on U, we can sum over all possible values of $U=2^j$ with $1\le U\ll B^kC^k$ at the cost a factor $O(\log BC)$. We also have the trivial bound where κ/κ_2 is replaced by 1. Thus for any choice of $b_2,\dots,b_{n-k},c_1,\dots,c_{\ell-1},c_{\ell+1},\dots,c_{n-k}$ we have

$$\ll\Big(\frac{Z_1}{B}+\frac{Z_\ell}{C}+\min\Big(1,\Big(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_2}\Big)^{1/k}\Big)\Big)\frac{BC\log BC}{Z_1Z_\ell}$$

choices of b_1,c_ℓ.

Let $j_B,j_C\le n-k$ chosen maximally such that $Z_{j_B}\ll B$ and $Z_{j_C}\ll C$. Then, since the number of choices of $\|b_i\|$ is $O(1+B/Z_i)$ (and similarly for c_i) the number of choices of $b_2,\dots,b_{n-k},c_1,\dots,c_{\ell-1},c_{\ell+1},\dots,c_{n-k}$ is

$$\ll\prod_{\substack{1\le i\le j_B\\ i\ne1}}\frac{B}{Z_i}\prod_{\substack{1\le i\le j_C\\ i\ne\ell}}\frac{C}{Z_i}.$$

We recall that we assume $B\le C$ so $j_B\le j_C$. Thus, splitting into the three cases $j_C\ge j_B\ge\ell$, $j_C\ge\ell>j_B$ and $\ell>j_C\ge j_B$ and pulling out a factor $Z_\ell^\ell/\prod_{i=1}^\ell Z_i$, we see that the above is

$$\ll\frac{Z_\ell^\ell}{\prod_{i=1}^\ell Z_i}\times\begin{cases}\dfrac{B^{j_B-1}C^{j_C-1}}{Z_1^{\ell-1}Z_\ell^{j_B+j_C-1-\ell}}, & j_C\ge j_B\ge\ell,\\ \dfrac{B^{j_B-1}C^{j_C-1}}{Z_1^{j_B-1}Z_\ell^{j_C-1}}, & j_C\ge\ell>j_B,\\ \dfrac{B^{j_B-1}C^{j_C}}{Z_1^{j_B-1}Z_\ell^{j_C}}, & \ell>j_C\ge j_B.\end{cases}$$

In each case above, we first multiply the bound by $BC/Z_1Z_\ell\gg1$ repeatedly until the exponent of C is $n-k-1$ (noting that since $n>3k$ and $\ell\le2k$, the initial exponent of C is at most $n-k-1$). We then repeatedly multiply by $Z_\ell/Z_1\ge1$ until the exponent of Z_ℓ in the denominator is $n-k-1$ (noting that the initial exponent of Z_ℓ in the denominator is always at least as large as the exponent of C in the numerator). Finally, we multiply by $B/Z_1\ge1$ repeatedly until the exponent of B is $n-k-1$. In all cases we multiply by Z_1/Z_ℓ at least once unless $j_B=j_C=\ell$,

in which case we multiply by $BC/Z_1Z_\ell \geq B/Z_1$ at least once. This gives us the bound (regardless of the size of j_B, j_C)

$$\ll \frac{Z_\ell^\ell}{\prod_{i=1}^\ell Z_i} \frac{B^{n-k-1}C^{n-k-1}}{Z_1^{n-k-1}Z_\ell^{n-k-1}} \Big(\frac{Z_1}{B} + \frac{Z_1}{Z_\ell}\Big).$$

Combining this with our bound on the number of choices of b_1, c_ℓ, we obtain that the total number of $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}$ is

$$\ll \Big(\frac{Z_1}{B} + \frac{Z_\ell}{C} + \min\Big(1, \Big(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_2}\Big)^{1/k}\Big)\Big)\Big(\frac{Z_1}{B} + \frac{Z_1}{Z_\ell}\Big) \frac{Z_\ell^\ell B^{n-k}C^{n-k} \log BC}{Z_1^{n-k}Z_\ell^{n-k} \prod_{i=1}^\ell Z_i}.$$

Finally, we note that since $Z_1 \leq B$

$$\frac{Z_1}{B}\Big(\frac{Z_1}{B} + \frac{Z_\ell}{C} + \min\Big(1, \Big(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_2}\Big)^{1/k}\Big)\Big) \ll \frac{Z_1Z_\ell}{BC} + \frac{Z_1}{B},$$

and since $Z_1 \leq Z_\ell$, $B \leq C$

$$\frac{Z_1}{Z_\ell}\Big(\frac{Z_1}{B} + \frac{Z_\ell}{C} + \Big(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_2}\Big)^{1/k}\Big) \ll \frac{Z_1}{B} + \Big(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_2}\Big)^{1/k}\frac{Z_1}{Z_\ell}.$$

These bounds give the result. □

Lemma 9.4 (Determinant rarely small for Archimedean reasons)**.** *Let $n > 3k$. Let*

$$\begin{aligned} S(A; B, C) = \{(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \in (\mathbb{Z}^n)^3 : \|\mathbf{a}\| \in [A, 2A], \|\mathbf{b}\| \in [B, 2B], \|\mathbf{c}\| \in [C, 2C], \\ \wedge(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \neq \mathbf{0},\ \mathbf{a} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{b},\mathbf{c}}\} \\ S(A; B, C; \kappa) = \{(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \in S(A; B, C) : \| \wedge (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})\| \leq \kappa B^k C^k\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then there is a constant $\delta = \delta(n, k) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \#S(A; B, C) &\ll A^{n-2k}B^{n-k}C^{n-k} \exp(O(\log BC)^2), \\ \#S(A; B, C; \kappa) &\ll \Big(\kappa^{1/k} + \frac{(BC)^{1/2-\delta}}{B}\Big) A^{n-2k}B^{n-k}C^{n-k} \exp(O(\log BC)^2). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, taking $\kappa = \epsilon_0^{8k} = \exp(-8k\sqrt[3]{\log X})$ and $B = C \gg X^\delta$, we have

$$\#\{(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2) \in \mathcal{S}(A; B, B) : 0 < \| \wedge (\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2)\| \ll \epsilon_0^{8k}B^{2k}\} \ll \epsilon_0^7 A^{n-2k}B^{2n-2k}.$$

Proof. We prove the result by induction. The Lemma trivially holds if $BC \ll 1$. Assume the statement of the Lemma holds whenever $BC < 2^J$ for some integer J.

Given $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}$ with $\wedge(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $\|\mathbf{b}\| \in [B, 2B], \|\mathbf{c}\| \in [C, 2C]$, any $\mathbf{a}$ such that $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$ is in $S(A; B, C, \kappa)$ satisfies $\|\mathbf{a}\| \in [A, 2A]$ and $\mathbf{a} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{b},\mathbf{c}}$. Since $\wedge(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \neq \mathbf{0}$, $\Lambda_{\mathbf{b},\mathbf{c}}$ is a lattice of rank $n - 2k$ and determinant $\ll B^kC^k$. If $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$ is the shortest vector in $\Lambda_{\mathbf{b},\mathbf{c}}$, then $\|\mathbf{v}\|^{n-2k} \ll B^kC^k$ and the number of $\mathbf{a} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{b},\mathbf{c}}$ with $\|\mathbf{a}\| \in [A, 2A]$ is $O(A^{n-2k}/\|\mathbf{v}\|^{n-2k})$. We recall that $\mathbf{v} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{b},\mathbf{c}}$ implies $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{v}}$.

Thus, putting $\|\mathbf{v}\|$ in one of $O(\log BV)$ dyadic ranges $[V,2V]$ we have

$$S(A;B,C;\kappa) \ll A^{n-2k}\sum_{\substack{\|\mathbf{b}\|\in[B,2B]\\ \|\mathbf{c}\|\in[C,2C]}}\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{b},\mathbf{c})\|^{n-2k}}$$

$$\ll A^{n-2k}(\log BC)\sup_{V^{n-2k}\ll B^kC^k}\sum_{\|\mathbf{v}\|\in[V,2V]}\frac{1}{V^{n-2k}}\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b},\mathbf{c}\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{v}}\\ \|\mathbf{b}\|\in[B,2B]\\ \|\mathbf{c}\|\in[C,2C]\\ \|\wedge(\mathbf{b},\mathbf{c})\|\le\kappa BC}}1. \tag{9.4}$$

Since $\mathbf{v}\neq\mathbf{0}$, $\Lambda_{\mathbf{v}}$ is a lattice of rank $n-k$. Let this have successive minima $Z_1\le\cdots\le Z_{n-k}$. We note that since $n>3k$ and $V^{n-2k}\ll B^kC^k$, we have

$$Z_1^kZ_{k+1}^k\ll Z_1^kZ_{k+1}^{n-2k}\ll\prod_{i=1}^{n-k}Z_i\ll\det(\Lambda_{\mathbf{v}})\ll V^k\ll(BC)^{k^2/(n-2k)}. \tag{9.5}$$

Thus $Z_1Z_{k+1}\ll(BC)^{1-2\delta}$ where $\delta=(n-3k)/n^2>0$. By Lemma 9.3 (taking $\ell=k+1$), the inner sum in (9.4) is

$$\ll\Big(\frac{Z_1}{B}+\frac{Z_1Z_{k+1}}{BC}+\min\Big(1,\Big(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_2}\Big)^{1/k}\Big)\frac{Z_1}{Z_{k+1}}\Big)\frac{Z_{k+1}^k}{\prod_{i=1}^kZ_i}\Big(\frac{BC}{Z_1Z_{k+1}}\Big)^{n-k}\log BC,$$

where $\kappa_2=\sup_{\mathbf{z}_1,\mathbf{z}_{k+1}}Z_1^{-k}Z_{k+1}^{-k}\|\wedge(\mathbf{z}_1,\mathbf{z}_{k+1})\|>0$ and the supremum is over all $\mathbf{z}_1,\mathbf{z}_{k+1}\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$ which can be extended to a basis $\mathbf{z}_1,\dots,\mathbf{z}_{n-k}$ with $Z_i\ll\|\mathbf{z}_i\|\ll Z_i$. We note that there are

$$\gg\frac{Z_{k+1}^k}{\prod_{i=1}^kZ_i}$$

different vectors $\mathbf{y}\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{v}}$ with $Z_{k+1}\ll\|\mathbf{y}\|\ll Z_{k+1}$ such that $0<\|\wedge(\mathbf{z}_1,\mathbf{y})\|\ll\kappa_2Z_1^kZ_{k+1}^k$, since given a basis $\mathbf{z}_1,\dots,\mathbf{z}_{n-k}$, all choices $\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{z}_{k+1}+\sum_{i=1}^k\lambda_i\mathbf{z}_i$ with $\|\wedge(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z}_1)\|\neq0$ and $\lambda_i\ll Z_{k+1}/Z_i$ satisfy this. Thus, putting $\|\mathbf{z}_1\|$, $\|\mathbf{y}\|$, κ_2 each in one of $O(\log BC)$ dyadic ranges $[Z,2Z]$, $[Y,2Y]$ and $[K,2K]$ respectively, we have

$$S(A;B,C;\kappa)\ll A^{n-2k}B^{n-k}C^{n-k}(\log BC)^5$$
$$\times\sup_{\substack{V^{n-2k}\ll B^kC^k\\ Z\ll Y\\ Z^kY^{n-2k}\ll V^k\\ (ZY)^{-k}\ll K\ll1}}\sum_{\|\mathbf{v}\|\in[V,2V]}\frac{T_{Z,Y;B,C;\kappa,K}}{Z^{n-k}Y^{n-k}V^{n-2k}}\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{z}_1,\mathbf{y}\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{v}}\\ \|\mathbf{z}_1\|\in[Z,2Z]\\ \|\mathbf{y}\|\in[Y,2Y]\\ 0<\|\wedge(\mathbf{z}_1,\mathbf{y})\|\ll K(ZY)^k}}1$$

$$\ll A^{n-2k}B^{n-k}C^{n-k}(\log BC)^5\sup_{V,Z,Y,K}\frac{T_{Z,Y;B,C;\kappa,K}S(V;Z,Y;K)}{Z^{n-k}Y^{n-k}V^{n-2k}}, \tag{9.6}$$

where

$$T_{Z,Y;B,C;\kappa,K}=\Big(\frac{Z}{B}+\frac{ZY}{BC}+\frac{Z}{Y}\min\Big(1,\Big(\frac{\kappa}{K}\Big)^{1/k}\Big)\Big),$$

and where the supremum in the final line is over V,Z,Y,K satisfying the same constraints as the first line.

If $BC<2^{J+\delta J}$, then, since $ZY\ll(BC)^{1-2\delta}$, we have $ZY<2^J$ if J is sufficiently large in terms of n,k. We can then apply the assumption of the Lemma, so, taking

the implied constant in the $O(\cdot)$ to be G, we have that

$$\frac{S(A;B,C;\kappa)}{A^{n-2k}B^{n-k}C^{n-k}(\log BC)^5}$$
$$\ll \sup_{V,Z,Y,E} T_{Z,Y;B,C;\kappa,K}\Big(K^{1/k}+\frac{(ZY)^{1/2-\delta}}{B}\Big)\exp(G(\log\log ZY)^2). \tag{9.7}$$

Since $Z \ll Y$ we have

$$\frac{Z}{Y}\min\Big(1,\Big(\frac{\kappa}{K}\Big)^{1/k}\Big)\Big(K^{1/k}+\frac{(ZY)^{1/2-\delta}}{B}\Big) \ll \kappa^{1/k}+\frac{(ZY)^{1/2-\delta}}{B}$$
$$\ll \kappa^{1/k}+\frac{(BC)^{1/2-\delta}}{B}.$$

Since $K \ll 1$, $Z \ll B$, $ZY \ll (BC)^{1-2\delta}$ and $Z \ll (ZY)^{1/2} \ll (BC)^{1/2-\delta}$ we have

$$\Big(\frac{Z}{B}+\frac{ZY}{BC}\Big)\Big(K^{1/k}+\frac{(ZY)^{1/2-\delta}}{B}\Big) \ll \frac{Z}{B}+\frac{ZY}{BC}+\frac{(ZY)^{1/2-\delta}}{B}$$
$$\ll \frac{(BC)^{1/2-\delta}}{B}+\frac{1}{(BC)^{\delta}} \ll \frac{(BC)^{1/2-\delta}}{B}.$$

Since $ZY \ll BC^{1-2\delta}$ we have $\log\log ZY < \log\log BC - 2\delta$. Substituting these bounds into (9.7) gives

$$\frac{S(A;B,C;\kappa)}{A^{n-2k}B^{n-k}C^{n-k}(\log BC)^5} \ll \Big(\frac{(BC)^{1/2-\delta}}{B}+\kappa^{1/k}\Big)\exp(G(\log\log BC-2\delta)^2).$$

Finally $\exp(G(\log\log BC-2\delta)^2) \ll (\log BC)^{-6}\exp(G(\log\log BC)^2)$ for $G > 2\delta^{-1}$, and so we obtain the claimed bound for $S(A;B,C;\kappa)$ if B,C are large enough.

The result for $S(A;B,C)$ follows immediately from (9.6) on noting that $T_{Z,Y;B,C;\kappa,K} \ll 1$ and $S(A;B,C) = S(A;B,C,1)$. □

In the course of the above proof, we also showed the following result, which we state separately for convenience.

Lemma 9.5. *Let $n > 3k$. Let $Z_i(\mathbf{a})$ be the i^{th} successive minimum of $\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{\|\mathbf{a}\|\ll A}\frac{Z_{k+1}(\mathbf{a})^k}{Z_1(\mathbf{a})^{n-k}Z_{k+1}(\mathbf{a})^{n-k}\prod_{i=1}^k Z_i(\mathbf{a})} \ll A^{n-2k}\exp(O(\log\log A)^2).$$

Lemma 9.6. *Let $n > 3k$, and let $\delta > 0$ be sufficiently small in terms of n and k. Given a vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^n\backslash\{\mathbf{0}\}$, let $Z_{n-k}(\mathbf{a})$ be the $n-k^{th}$ successive minima of $\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$. Then if $A^{k/(1-\delta)} < B^{n-k}$ we have*

$$\#\{(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2) \in \mathcal{S}(A;B,B) :\ Z_{n-k}(\mathbf{a}) > B^{1-\delta/2}\} \ll A^{n-2k}B^{2n-2k-\delta/2}.$$

Proof. Let $Z_1,\dots,Z_{n-k}$ be the successive minima of $\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$. Since $A^{k/(1-\delta)} < B^{n-k}$, $n > 3k$ and $Z_1^k Z_{k+1}^{n-2k} \ll \det(\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}) \ll A^k$, we have $Z_1 Z_{k+1} \ll B^{2-2\delta}$. Let j be chosen

maximally such that $Z_j \ll B$. Then the number of $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2 \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$ is

$$\ll \frac{B^{2j}}{\prod_{i=1}^j Z_i^2} \ll \frac{Z_{k+1}^k}{\prod_{i=1}^k Z_i} \times \begin{cases} \frac{B^{2j}}{Z_1^j Z_{k+1}^j}, & j \le k, \\ \frac{B^{2j}}{Z_1^k Z_{k+1}^{2j-k}}, & k+1 \le j < n-k, \\ \frac{B^{2n-2k}}{Z_1^k Z_{k+1}^{2n-3k-2} Z_{n-k}^2}, & j = n-k. \end{cases}$$

Since $Z_{n-k} > B^{1-\delta/2}$ and $Z_1 Z_{k+1} \ll B^{2-2\delta}$ and $n > 3k$, we have that in each case this is

$$\ll \frac{Z_{k+1}^k}{\prod_{i=1}^k Z_i} \frac{B^{2n-2k-\delta}}{Z_1^{n-k} Z_{k+1}^{n-k}}.$$

Thus the number of triples $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2)$ counted in the Lemma is

$$\ll B^{2n-2k-\delta} \sum_{\|\mathbf{a}\| \in [A,2A]} \frac{Z_{k+1}^k}{\prod_{i=1}^k Z_i} \frac{1}{Z_1^{n-k} Z_2^{n-k}}.$$

But by Lemma 9.5, this is $\ll A^{n-2k} B^{2n-2k-\delta/2}$, as required. □

Lemma 9.7 (Diagonal Terms)**.** *Let $n > 3k$ and let $\delta > 0$ be sufficiently small in terms of n and k. Then if $A^{k/(1-\delta)} < B^{n-k}$ we have*

$$\#\{(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2) \in S(A; B, B) : \wedge(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2) = \mathbf{0}\} \ll A^{n-2k} B^{2n-2k-\delta/3}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 9.6, we only need to count the contribution from $\mathbf{a}$ with $Z_{n-k}(\mathbf{a}) \ll B^{1-\delta/2}$. Let $\mathbf{a}$ be given, so we wish to count $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2 \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$ with $\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2) = \mathbf{0}$. Let $\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$ have a simplified basis $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{n-k}$, and let $\mathbf{b}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} \lambda_i \mathbf{z}_i$, $\mathbf{b}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} \gamma_i \mathbf{z}_i$, with $\gamma_i, \lambda_i \ll B/Z_i$, where $Z_i = Z_i(\mathbf{a})$ are the successive minima of $\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$. Since $\wedge(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_{k+1}) \neq \mathbf{0}$, we have that $\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2) = \mathbf{0}$ only if a non-zero polynomial (of degree $O(1)$) in the λ_i, γ_i vanishes. Thus the number of choices of λ_i, γ_i is

$$\ll \Big(1 + \frac{B}{Z_{n-k}}\Big) \prod_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \Big(1 + \frac{B}{Z_i}\Big)^2 \ll \frac{B^{2n-2k-\delta/2}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n-k} Z_i^2} \ll \frac{B^{2n-2k-\delta/2}}{Z_1^{n-k} Z_{k+1}^{n-k}},$$

where we have used the fact that $Z_{n-k} \ll B^{1-\delta/2}$ and $n > 3k$. But then by Lemma 9.5, this means the size of the set in the Lemma is

$$\ll \sum_{\|\mathbf{a}\| \in [A,2A]} \frac{Z_{k+1}^k}{\prod_{i=1}^k Z_i} \frac{B^{2n-2k-\delta/2}}{Z_1^{n-k} Z_{k+1}^{n-k}} \ll A^{n-2k} B^{2n-2k-\delta/3}.$$ □

9.2. **Non-Archimedean estimates.** We now consider $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2$ for which the determinant of $\Lambda_{\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2}$ is small because $D_{\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2}$ is large.

Lemma 9.8. *Let $\epsilon > 0$. Let $f_1, \dots, f_\ell \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be $\ell \ge 2$ polynomials of degree at most d with coefficients of size at most F. Assume $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_\ell)$ has no non-constant common factor in $\mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$, and $e_p \in \mathbb{N}$ are such that $\mathbf{f}$ does not vanish on $(\mathbb{Z}/p^{e_p}\mathbb{Z})^n$ for any prime p. Let $E = \prod_{e_p > 1} p^{e_p}$.*

Then for any reals $D_0 \geq 1$ and $1 \leq X_{min} \leq X_1, \dots, X_n \leq X_{max}$ we have

$$\#\{(\mathbf{x}, D) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n, |x_i| \leq X_i, D > D_0, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod{D}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}\}$$
$$\ll \Big(\frac{1}{D_0^{1/2d}} + \frac{1}{X_{min}}\Big)(D_0 F X_{max})^{\epsilon} E^n \prod_{i=1}^{n} X_i.$$

Here the implied constant depends only on ℓ, n, d, ϵ.

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume that $X_{max} = X_1 \geq \cdots \geq X_n = X_{min}$.

We first choose $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) \not\equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod{p^{e_p}}$ for any $p \leq d$ and $0 < u_i \ll E$. This is possible since $\mathbf{f}$ doesn't vanish on $(\mathbb{Z}/p^{e_p}\mathbb{Z})^n$. Similarly, for any prime p with $e_p = 1$, the fact $\mathbf{f}$ doesn't vanish on $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ means that there is a polynomial $f_{p,1} \in \{f_1, \dots, f_\ell\}$ such that $f_{p,1}$ has a non-zero coefficient. Viewing $f_{p,1}(\mathbf{x})$ as a polynomial in x_1, and selecting a non-zero coefficient we find a non-zero polynomial $f_{p,2}$ in $x_2, \dots, x_n$ such that $f_{p,1}$ is a non-zero polynomial in x_1 if $f_{p,2} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Repeating this we obtain polynomials $f_{p,2}, \dots, f_{p,n}$ with $f_{p,j}$ a non-zero polynomial in $x_j, \dots x_n$ and $f_{p,j}$ is a non-zero polynomial in x_j if $f_{p,j+1} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. We then choose non-zero integers $v_n, \dots, v_1$ in turn such that $f_{p,j}(v_j, \dots, v_n) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ for any prime p which divides all components of $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u})$ and with $e_p = 1$. Since $\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u})\| \ll (FE)^{O(1)}$ has $O(\log FE)$ such prime factors, and a non-zero polynomial of degree d in one variable can vanish at at most d points in $\mathbf{F}_p$, we can choose $v_1, \dots, v_n$ such that $v_i \ll \log FE$. Therefore any integer dividing all components of $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{v})$ and $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u})$ must divide E. Thus, without loss of generality, it is sufficient to count pairs $(\mathbf{x}, D)$ such that $D/(D, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{v})) \geq (D/E)^{1/2}$ for some $\|\mathbf{v}\| \ll E \log F$.

We note that since $v_n \neq 0$, $|v_i| \ll E \log F$ and $X_1 \geq \cdots \geq X_n$, we can write any vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ with $|x_i| \leq X_i$ as $v_n \mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i' \mathbf{e}_i + x_n' \mathbf{v}$ with $|x_i'| \ll X_i E \log F$, where $\mathbf{e}_i$ are the standard basis vectors of $\mathbb{Z}^n$. Thus it is sufficient to count pairs $(\mathbf{x}, D)$ with $|x_i| \ll X_i E \log F$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 0 \pmod{D}$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{f}(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i' \mathbf{e}_i + x_n' \mathbf{v})$.

By the Euclidean algorithm (or calculating a suitable resultant) $D | \tilde{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x})$ only if $D | g(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ for some non-zero polynomial g independent of x_n and of degree at most d^2 and with coefficients of size at most $F^{O(1)}$, since the components of $\mathbf{f}$ have no non-constant polynomial common factor. There are

$$\ll \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} X_i E \log F \ll X_{min}^{-1} (E \log F)^{n-1} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} X_i$$

choices of $x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}$ such that $g(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) = 0$ and $|x_i| \ll X_i E \log F$. For any such choice there are $O(X_n E \log F)$ choices of x_n such that $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $O((X_{max} EF)^{\epsilon})$ choices of $D | \tilde{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x})$. Thus we may assume that $g(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \neq 0$. There are then $O((EF X_{max})^{\epsilon})$ choices of $D | g(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$. We are only counting integers D with $D/(D, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{v})) \geq D^{1/2} E^{-1/2}$, and so a suitable linear combination of the components of $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x})$ gives a polynomial of degree at most d in x_n such that the lead coefficient, h say, satisfies $D/(D, h) > D^{1/2} E^{-1/2}$. Then by Lemma 9.2 we have that the number of choices of x_n such that this polynomial vanishes mod D is

$$\ll \Big(1 + X_n \Big(\frac{D}{(D, h)}\Big)^{1/d}\Big) D^{\epsilon} \ll D_0^{\epsilon} E X_n \Big(\frac{1}{X_{min}} + \frac{1}{D_0^{1/2d}}\Big).$$

This gives the result. □

Lemma 9.9. *We have*

$$\#\{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbb{F}_p^n : \wedge(\mathbf{b})=\mathbf{0}\}\ll p^{k-1}.$$

Proof. We may assume that p is sufficiently large, so $\theta\not\equiv 0 \pmod p$ and $p>n$. We recall that if $\wedge(\mathbf{b})=\mathbf{0}\in\mathbb{F}_p$ then there exists constants $c_0,\dots,c_{k-1}$ not all 0 such that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} c_i T^i(\mathbf{b})=\mathbf{0}.$$

We argue in the case $c_0,c_{k-1}\neq 0$; the other cases are entirely analogous. By inverting c_0, we have $\mathbf{b}=T^0(\mathbf{b})=\sum_{i=1}^{k-1}c_i'T^i(\mathbf{b})$ for constants c_i' with $c_{k-1}'\neq 0$. Thus, letting $b_{n+j}=b_j/\theta$, we have $b_j=\sum_{i=1}^{k-1}c_i'b_{j-i}$ for all $j\in\mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, we may assume that $\mathbf{b}$ does not satisfy any other recurrence equation of this type because in that case, we may take a linear combination and have $c_{k-1}'=0$. This is a difference equation, and so $b_j=\sum_{i=1}^{k-1}P_i(j)\lambda_i^j$ for some polynomials $P_1,\dots,P_\ell$ with total degree at most $k-1$, and constants λ_i in a finite extension of $\mathbb{F}_p$. Moreover, the monomials $j^{m_1}\lambda_{m_2}^j$ uniquely determine $c_1',\dots,c_{k-1}'$ as the coefficients of the monic polynomial $X^{k-1}-\sum_{i=1}^{k-1}c_i'X^{k-i-1}\in\mathbb{F}_p[X]$ of least degree which has λ_i as a root with multiplicity at least $\deg P_i$.

But then $\sum_i P_i(n+j)\lambda_i^{n+j}=b_{n+j}=b_j/\theta=\theta^{-1}\sum_i P_i(j)\lambda_i^j$ for all j. This gives a fixed linear combination of the monomials $j^{m_1}\lambda_{m_2}^j$ which vanishes for all j, and so as in Lemma 8.2, the coefficients of all monomials must be zero. Thus, on comparing the coefficient of $j^\ell\lambda_i^j$ and letting $p_{\ell,i}$ be the coefficient of x^ℓ in $P_i(x)$, we have $p_{\ell,i}=\theta\lambda_i^n\sum_{m\geq\ell}p_{m,i}n^{m-\ell}\binom{m}{\ell}$. By considering the highest degree coefficients first, we see that either $P_i(x)=0$ or $\lambda_i^n=\theta^{-1}$ and $p_{m,i}=0$ for all $m\geq 2$.

Thus we have $b_j=\sum_i p_{i,1}\lambda_i^j$ where for each i we have $\lambda_i^n=\theta^{-1}$. But then there are $O(1)$ possibilities for the monomials appearing in b_j, and so $O(1)$ possible choices for the coefficients $c_1',\dots,c_{k-1}'$. Since $\mathbf{b}$ is uniquely determined by $c_1',\dots,c_{k-1}'$ and $b_1,\dots,b_{k-1}$, there are $O(p^{k-1})$ different possible choices of $\mathbf{b}$. □

Remark. *We expect the bound of Lemma 9.9 to be sharp for infinitely many p, since it involves n equations in $n+k-1$ variables.*

Lemma 9.10 (Determinant rarely small for non-Archimedean reasons)**.** *Let $n>3k$, $\delta>0$ and $A^{k/(1-\delta)}<B^{n-k}$. Then we have for any constant $C>0$*

$$\#\{(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\in\mathcal{S}(A;B,B) : D_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}>\epsilon_0^{-C},\ \mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{R}_A\}\ll_C \epsilon_0^{C/4k}A^{n-2k}B^{2n-2k}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 9.6, we can restrict our attention to $\mathbf{a}$ such that $\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$ has all successive minima $Z_1,\dots,Z_{n-k}\ll B^{1-\delta/2}$, and by Lemma 9.7 to $\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2$ with $\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\neq\mathbf{0}$. By Lemma 9.5 (since $\epsilon_0^{-C/4k}>\exp(O(\log\log B)^2)$), it suffices to show for each such $\mathbf{a}$ that

$$1\ll\frac{\epsilon_0^{C/2k}B^{2n-2k}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n-k}Z_i^2}. \tag{9.8}$$

$$\sum_{D>\epsilon_0^{-20k}}\ \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}\\ \|\mathbf{b}_1\|,\|\mathbf{b}_2\|\in[B,2B]\\ D|\wedge(\mathbf{b},\mathbf{c})\neq\mathbf{0}}}$$

We split our argument into different cases, depending on whether $D \le B^{\delta/2}$ or $D > B^{\delta/2}$. We first consider $D \le B^{\delta/2}$. We recall that $\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2)$ is a vector of homogeneous polynomials in the coefficients of $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2$ with coefficients of size $O(1)$ and degree at most $2k$. If $\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2) \equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod p$ then there exists constants $c_0, \dots, c_{k-1}, d_0, \dots, d_{k-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ at least one of which is 1, such that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} c_i T^i(\mathbf{b}_1) \equiv \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} d_i T^i(\mathbf{b}_2) \pmod p.$$

By symmetry we may assume that one of the c_i is equal to 1. Given a choice of $c_0, \dots, c_{k-1}, d_0, \dots, d_{k-1}$ and $\mathbf{b}_2$, we see that we are counting solutions $\mathbf{b}_1 \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$ to a linear equation $M\mathbf{b}_1 \equiv \mathbf{v} \pmod p$ for some given $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$. The number of such solutions in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ is at most the number of solutions of $M\mathbf{b}_1 \equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod D$ by linearity (it is the same if $\mathbf{v}$ is in the image of M). But the number of $\mathbf{b}_1, c_0, \dots, c_{k-1}$ with one of the c_i equal to 1 and $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} c_i T^i(\mathbf{b}_1) \equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod p$ is the number of $\mathbf{b}_1 \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that $\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1) \equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod p$. Let $\overline{\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}}$ be the reduction of $\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}} \pmod p$, which contains p^{n-k} elements since any basis $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{n-k}$ is linearly independent $\pmod p$. There are $O(p^k)$ choices of $d_0, \dots, d_{k-1} \pmod p$ and $O(p^{n-k})$ choices of $\mathbf{b}_2 \in \overline{\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}}$. By Lemma 9.9 there are $O(p^{k-1})$ choices of $\mathbf{b}_1 \pmod p$ such that $\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1) \equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod p$. Hence in total there are $O(p^{n+k-1}) \ll p^{2n-2k-2}$ choices of $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2 \in \overline{\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}}$ such that $\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2) \equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod p$. Since there are p^{2n-2k} choices of $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2 \in \overline{\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}}$, we have that $\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2) = \mathbf{0} \pmod p$ is given by a system of degree k polynomials such that at least 2 polynomials are non-zero and have no common factor when viewed $\pmod p$ and restricted to $\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$ if p is sufficiently large.

If p is bounded by a constant, then since the polynomials defining $\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2)$ have degree at most k and coefficients of size $O(1)$, there is a fixed constant J (depending only on n, θ) such that $\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2) \not\equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod{p^J}$ identically on $\overline{\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}}$ for any prime p and any $\mathbf{a}$. Thus $\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2) \equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod{p^J}$ is also given by the vanishing of at least one non-zero polynomial of degree at most k when restricted to $\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}} \pmod{p^J}$.

Let $D = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} p_i^{e_i} = D_1 D_2$ with $D_1 = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} p_i$, $D_2 = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} p^{e_i - 1}$ be factorized into square-free and remaining parts. By the above discussion, there are $O(p_i^{2n-2k-2})$ choices of $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2 \pmod{p_i}$ with $\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2) \equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod{p_i}$ and $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2 \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}} \pmod p$. Thus, by Lemma 9.2, there are $O(p_i^{2n-2k-2} p_i^{(e_i-1)(n-k-1/k)+o(1)})$ such choices of $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2 \pmod{p_i^{e_i}}$. Thus, by the Chinese remainder theorem, the total the number of choices of possible residue classes for $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2 \pmod D$ is

$$\ll \frac{D^{2n-2k}}{D_1^2 D_2^{1/k+o(1)}}.$$

Since we are considering $D \le B^{\delta/2} < B/Z_{n-k}$, the number of choices of $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2 \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$ with $\|\mathbf{b}_1\|, \|\mathbf{b}_2\|$ in any given residue class $\pmod D$ is $O(B^{2n-2k} D^{-(2n-2k)} / \prod_{i=1}^{n-k} Z_i^2)$.

Thus the total contribution from $\epsilon_0^{-C} < D < B^{\delta/2}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\ll \sum_{\substack{D_1D_2>\epsilon_0^{-C}\\ p|D_1\Rightarrow p|D_2}} \frac{D^{2n-2k}}{D_1^2D_2^{1/k+o(1)}}\frac{B^{2n-2k}}{D^{2n-2k}\prod_{i=1}^{n-k}Z_i^2}\\
&\ll \frac{\epsilon_0^{C/2k}B^{2n-2k}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n-k}Z_i^2}\sum_{\substack{D_1D_2>\epsilon_0^{-C}\\ p|D_1\Rightarrow p|D_2}}\frac{1}{D_1^{2-1/2k}D_2^{1/2k+o(1)}}\\
&\ll \frac{\epsilon_0^{C/2k}B^{2n-2k}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n-k}Z_i^2}\sum_{D_1}\frac{\tau(D_1)}{D_1^{2-1/2k}}\\
&\ll \frac{\epsilon_0^{C/2k}B^{2n-2k}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n-k}Z_i^2}. \qquad (9.9)
\end{aligned}$$

This is sufficient to give (9.8) when $D \le B^{\delta/2}$.

Thus we are left to consider the contributions when $D > B^{\delta/2}$. Let $\mathbf{z}_1,\dots,\mathbf{z}_{n-k}$ be a basis for $\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$, and so $\mathbf{b}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-k}\lambda_i\mathbf{z}_i$, $\mathbf{b}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-k}\gamma_i\mathbf{z}_i$ for some $\lambda_i,\gamma_i \ll B/Z_i$. From our above discussion, $\wedge(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k}\lambda_i\mathbf{z}_i, \sum_{i=1}^{n-k}\gamma_i\mathbf{z}_i)$ is a vector of polynomials of degree k in $\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_{n-k},\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_{n-k}$, which does not vanish identically $\pmod p$ for p sufficiently large, or $\pmod{p^J}$ for some fixed J if $p \ll 1$. Therefore, by Lemma 9.8 the number of pairs $(\mathbf{v}, D)$ with $D > B^{\epsilon}$ such that $\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2) \equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod D$ but $\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2) \neq \mathbf{0}$ is

$$\ll B^{-\delta/4k}\prod_{i=1}^{n-k}\frac{B^2}{Z_i^2}. \qquad (9.10)$$

Recalling that $\epsilon_0 = \exp(-\sqrt[3]{\log X})$ and $B \gg X^{\delta}$, we see (9.10) gives (9.8) in the remaining range $D > B^{\delta/2}$. □

9.3. **Separation of variables.** We assume that $n > 3k$. We recall from (9.3) that we wish to show

$$\sum_{\substack{\|\mathbf{b}_1\|,\|\mathbf{b}_2\|\in[B,2B]\\ \mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2\equiv\mathbf{b}_0 \pmod{\tilde q}}} g_{\mathbf{b}_1}\overline{g_{\mathbf{b}_2}}\sum_{\mathbf{a}\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}\cap\mathcal{R}_A} 1 \ll \epsilon_0^2A^{n-2k}B^{2n-2k}$$

for any choice of $\mathbf{b}_0$, where A, B satisfy $X \ll AB \ll X$ and $X^{k+\epsilon/2} \ll B \ll X^{n-2k-\epsilon/2}$. For δ sufficiently small in terms of ϵ, we see that this implies that $B^{2(1+\delta)k/(n-2k)} < A < B^{(1-\delta)(n-k)/k}$.

Combining Lemmas 9.4, 9.7, 9.10 and recalling that $g_{\mathbf{b}} \ll \epsilon_0^{-2}$, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\|\mathbf{b}_1\|,\|\mathbf{b}_2\|\in[B,2B]\\ \|\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\|\le\epsilon_0^{8k}B^{2k} \text{ or } D_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}>\epsilon_0^{-24k}}} |g_{\mathbf{b}_1}\overline{g_{\mathbf{b}_2}}|\sum_{\mathbf{a}\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}\cap\mathcal{R}_A} 1 \ll \epsilon_0^2A^{n-2k}B^{2n-2k}.$$

Thus we may restrict our attention to $\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2$ such that $\|\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\| \ge \epsilon_0^{8k}B^{2k}$ and $D_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2} \le \epsilon_0^{-30k}$.

We first deal with the $D_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}$ factor. By Moebius inversion, our sum is

$$\sum_{D\le \epsilon_0^{-30k}} \sideset{}{^*}\sum_{\substack{\|\mathbf{b}_1\|,\|\mathbf{b}_2\|\in[B,2B]\\ D_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}=D}} g_{\mathbf{b}_1}\overline{g_{\mathbf{b}_2}} \sum_{\mathbf{a}\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}\cap\mathcal{R}_A} 1$$
$$= \sum_{D\le \epsilon_0^{-30k}} \sum_{d} \mu(d) \sideset{}{^*}\sum_{\substack{\|\mathbf{b}_1\|,\|\mathbf{b}_2\|\in[B,2B]\\ Dd\mid D_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}}} g_{\mathbf{b}_1}\overline{g_{\mathbf{b}_2}} \sum_{\mathbf{a}\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}\cap\mathcal{R}_A} 1.$$

where $\sum^*$ indicates that we have the condition that $\|\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\|\ge \epsilon_0^{8k}B^{2k}$ and $\mathbf{b}_1\equiv\mathbf{b}_2\equiv\mathbf{b}_0 \pmod{\tilde{q}}$. Since $|g_{\mathbf{b}}|\ll\epsilon_0^{-2}$, Lemma 9.10 shows the contribution from $d\ge\epsilon_0^{-200k^2}$ is negligible, leaving us to estimate

$$\sum_{d<\epsilon_0^{-200k^2},\, D<\epsilon_0^{-30k}} \mu(d) \sideset{}{^*}\sum_{\substack{\|\mathbf{b}_1\|,\|\mathbf{b}_2\|\in[B,2B]\\ dD\mid D_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}}} g_{\mathbf{b}_1}\overline{g_{\mathbf{b}_2}} \sum_{\mathbf{a}\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}\cap\mathcal{R}_A} 1.$$

Thus, splitting the sum over $\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2$ into residue classes modulo $[dD,\tilde{q}]$, and recalling $\tilde{q}=(\theta n)^n q^* N(\mathfrak{c})\le\epsilon_0^{-1}=\exp(\sqrt[3]{\log B})$, it suffices to show that

$$\sup_{\substack{D\ll\epsilon_0^{-300k^2}\\ \mathbf{d}_1,\mathbf{d}_2\in\mathbb{Z}^n}} \sideset{}{^*}\sum_{\substack{\|\mathbf{b}_1\|,\|\mathbf{b}_2\|\in[B,2B]\\ (\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\equiv(\mathbf{d}_1,\mathbf{d}_2)\pmod D}} g_{\mathbf{b}_1}\overline{g_{\mathbf{b}_2}} \sum_{\mathbf{a}\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}\cap\mathcal{R}_A} 1 \ll \epsilon_0^{400k^2}A^{n-2k}B^{2n-2k}.$$

By Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 8.1, we have that the inner sum is

$$\frac{D_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}_A}{\|\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\|}+O\Big(1+\frac{A^{n-2k-1}}{V^{n-2k-1}}\Big),$$

where V is the length of the shortest vector in $\Lambda_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}$. By Lemma 9.4, since $V^{n-2k}\ll\det\Lambda_{\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2}\ll B^{2k}$, this error term contributes

$$\ll B^{2n}\epsilon_0^{-4}+\frac{A^{n-2k-1}(\log B)\epsilon_0^{-4}}{V^{n-2k-1}}\sup_{V^{n-2k}\ll B^{2k}} S(V;B,B)$$
$$\ll B^{2n+o(1)}+A^{n-2k-1}B^{2n-2k+2k/(n-2k)+o(1)}.$$

This is $\ll A^{n-2k-\delta/2}B^{2n-2k}$ since $A\gg B^{2(1+\delta)k/(n-2k)}$ by assumption. Thus we may restrict our attention to the main term.

We split the sum over $\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2$ into $O(\delta_0^{-2n})$ hypercubes $\mathcal{C}_1,\dots,\mathcal{C}_\ell$ of side length $\delta_0 B$. There are $O(\delta_0^{-2n+1})$ hypercubes which do not have all points with norm either in $[B_0,2B_0]$ or outside of this interval. Thus, on choosing $\delta_0=\epsilon_0^{2000k^2}$ we see that these contribute a negligible amount. Thus we are left to show

$$\sum_{1\le i,j\le\ell} \sideset{}{^*}\sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\in\mathcal{C}_i\times\mathcal{C}_j\\ (\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\equiv(\mathbf{d}_1,\mathbf{d}_2)\pmod D}} \frac{g_{\mathbf{b}_1}\overline{g_{\mathbf{b}_2}}\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}_A}{\|\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\|}\ll\delta_0^{1/3}A^{n-2k}B^{2n-2k},$$

where $(\mathcal{C}_i)_{1\le i\le\ell}$ are the $O(\delta_0^{-n})$ hypercubes with all points in $\mathcal{C}_i$ having norm in $[B,2B]$ (since $g_{\mathfrak{b}}=0$ if $N(\mathfrak{b})\notin[B,2B]$).

Since the hypercubes have side length $\delta_0 B$, and $\|\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\|$ is a continuous function in the components of $\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2$, with the derivative with respect to any component $O(B^{2k-1})$, we have that $\|\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\|$ is almost constant on $\mathcal{C}_i\times\mathcal{C}_j$. Specifically, $\|\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\|=\|\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1',\mathbf{b}_2')\|(1+O(\delta_0^{1/2}))$ for any $\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_1'\in\mathcal{C}_i$, $\mathbf{b}_2,\mathbf{b}_2'\in\mathcal{C}_2$ if

$\|\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1',\mathbf{b}_2')\|\geq \delta_0^{1/2}B^{2k}$. Thus, let $\mathbf{c}_i$ be the vector in the center of $\mathcal{C}_i$ and extend the sum to all pairs $(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\in\mathcal{C}_i\times\mathcal{C}_j$ for which $\|\wedge(\mathbf{c}_i,\mathbf{c}_j)\|\geq \epsilon_0^{-8k}B^{2k}/2$ (which introduces a negligible error from the above estimates). We are left to bound

$$\sum_{1\leq i,j\leq \ell}\frac{1}{\epsilon_0^{8k}B^{2k}}\Big|\sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\in\mathcal{C}_i\times\mathcal{C}_j\\ (\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\equiv(\mathbf{d}_1,\mathbf{d}_2)\pmod D}} g_{\mathbf{b}_1}\overline{g_{\mathbf{b}_2}}\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}_A\Big|.$$

Similarly, $\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}_A$ is the volume of a region whose dependence on $\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2$ is through constraints which are linear in the coefficients, and so $\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}_A\ll A^{n-2k}$ can vary by at most $O(\delta_0A^{n-2k})$ on $\mathcal{C}_i\times\mathcal{C}_j$. This error contributes $O(\delta_0\epsilon_0^{-8k}A^{n-2k}B^{2n-2k})$ in total, and so is negligible. Thus we may replace $\operatorname{vol}\mathcal{R}_A$ with the volume evaluated at $\mathbf{c}_i,\mathbf{c}_j$, which we bound by $O(A^{n-2k})$. Thus it suffices to show for any choice of $D<\delta_0^{-1/2}$ and any i,j, $\mathbf{d}_1$, $\mathbf{d}_2$

$$\sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\in\mathcal{C}_i\times\mathcal{C}_j\\ (\mathbf{b}_1,\mathbf{b}_2)\equiv(\mathbf{d}_1,\mathbf{d}_2)\pmod D}} g_{\mathbf{b}_1}\overline{g_{\mathbf{b}_2}}\ll \delta_0^{2n+1/2}B^{2n}.$$

This sum factorizes as

$$\Big(\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}_1\in\mathcal{C}_i\\ \mathbf{b}_1\equiv\mathbf{d}_1\pmod D}} g_{\mathbf{b}_1}\Big)\Big(\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}_2\in\mathcal{C}_j\\ \mathbf{b}_1\equiv\mathbf{d}_2\pmod D}}\overline{g_{\mathbf{b}_2}}\Big).$$

We now replace $g_{\mathbf{b}}$ with the original coefficients $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})-\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})$. As in Lemma 9.1, the error introduced by making this change is

$$\begin{aligned}\ll \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ \tau(\mathfrak{b})>\epsilon_0^{-2}}}\tau(\mathfrak{b})\log X &\ll \epsilon_0^{2000k^2}\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}}\tau(\mathfrak{b})^{1000k^2+2}\\ &\ll \delta_0\sum_{N(\mathfrak{d})<B^{1/2}}\tau(N(\mathfrak{d}))^{O(1)}\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{d}\in(\mathbb{Z}/N(\mathfrak{d})\mathbb{Z})^n\\ \mathfrak{d}\mid\sum_{i=1}^n d_i\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}\mathbf{b}\equiv\mathbf{d}}}\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{C}\\ (\mathrm{mod}\ N(\mathfrak{d}))}}1\\ &\ll \delta_0^{n+1}B^n\sum_{N(\mathfrak{d})<B^{1/2}}\frac{\tau(\mathfrak{d})^{O(1)}}{N(\mathfrak{d})}\\ &\ll \delta_0^{n+1}(\log B)^{O(1)}B^n.\end{aligned}$$

Since the trivial bound for either sum is $\delta_0^nB^n\epsilon_0^{-2}$, this makes a negligible contribution. Thus we are left to show that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b}_1\in\mathcal{C}_i\\ \mathbf{b}_1\equiv\mathbf{d}_1\pmod D}}\Big(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})-\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_{\mathcal{R}_2}(\mathfrak{b})\Big)\ll\delta_0^{n+1/2}B^{2n}.$$

This follows from Lemma 7.5. This then gives the bound (9.3), and so completes our proof of Proposition 5.1. Thus we have established Theorem 1.2, and Theorem 1.1 in the case $K=\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt[n]{\theta})$.

10. General $K=\mathbb{Q}(\omega)$

In this section we sketch the changes in the argument required to generalize the above result to $K=\mathbb{Q}(\omega)$ for ω a root of a monic irreducible polynomial in $\mathbb{Z}[X]$

instead of $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt[n]{\theta})$. Most of the arguments work with any occurrence of $\sqrt[n]{\theta^{i-1}}$ simply replaced by ω^{i-1}, but in a few places we require some small modifications to the argument. We first consider the argument of Sections 7-9 which establishes the Type II estimate Proposition 5.1.

The argument of Section 7 is essentially unchanged, as in no place did we use the explicit structure of K being of the form $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt[n]{\theta})$.

In Section 8 we make use of the explicit multiplication rules in $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]$, and so we need to modify this for $\mathbb{Z}[\omega]$. We see that

$$\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i\omega^{i-1}\Big)\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i\omega^{i-1}\Big) = \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i\omega^{i-1}\Big)$$

with

$$c_\ell = \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} b_{\ell+1-i}a_i + \sum_{i+j\geq n+2} \varepsilon_{i,j,\ell} b_i a_j\Big) = T_{n-\ell}(\mathbf{b})\cdot\mathbf{a},$$

where $\varepsilon_{i,j,\ell} \in \mathbb{Z}$ are some constants depending on the coefficients of the minimal polynomial f of ω. Here $T_0, \dots, T_{n-1}$ are linear maps with the property that $T_j(\mathbf{b})_\ell$ is equal to $b_{n+1-j-\ell}$ plus some linear combination of $b_{n-\ell+2}, \dots, b_n$ if $n \geq \ell + j$. Again, we let $\diamond$ denote the above operation, so that $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{b} \diamond \mathbf{a}$. We then have the corresponding definition of the lattices $\Lambda_{\mathbf{v}}$ and $\Lambda_{\mathbf{v}_1,\mathbf{v}_2}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_{\mathbf{v}} &= \{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{Z}^n : (\mathbf{x}\diamond\mathbf{v})_i = 0,\, n-k < i \leq n\}\\
&= \{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{Z}^n : \mathbf{x}\cdot T_i(\mathbf{v}) = 0,\, 0 \leq i \leq k-1\},\\
\Lambda_{\mathbf{v}_1,\mathbf{v}_2} &= \{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{Z}^n : (\mathbf{x}\diamond\mathbf{v}_1)_i = (\mathbf{x}\diamond\mathbf{v}_2)_i = 0,\, n-k < i \leq n\}\\
&= \{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{Z}^n : \mathbf{x}\cdot T_i(\mathbf{v}_1) = \mathbf{x}\cdot T_i(\mathbf{v}_2) = 0,\, 0 \leq i \leq k-1\},
\end{aligned}$$

and Lemma 8.1 then holds in an identical way with T^i replaced by T_i. In place of Lemmas 8.2 and 9.9 we have the following two simple Lemmas.

Lemma 10.1. *Given $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^n\backslash\{\mathbf{0}\}$, let $\mathcal{L}$ be a linear subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\wedge(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{L}$. Then $\mathcal{L}$ has dimension at most $2k-1$.*

Proof. We note that for $\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{Z}^n\backslash\{\mathbf{0}\}$ we have $N(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\omega^{i-1}) \neq 0$, so the columns $T_0(\mathbf{x}), \dots, T_{n-1}(\mathbf{x})$ in the multiplication-by-$\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\omega^{i-1}$ matrix are linearly independent. Thus there are no constants $c_0, \dots, c_{k-1}$ not all zero such that $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} c_i T_i(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$. Thus , by linearity of the T_i, we see that given $c_0, \dots, c_{k-1}$ not all zero and given $d_0, \dots, d_{k-1}$ there is at most one $\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{Z}^n$ such that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} c_i T_i(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} d_i T_i(\mathbf{b}).$$

Hence if $\wedge(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{0}$ then $\mathbf{x}$ is given by vector of rational polynomial expressions in $c_0, \dots, c_{k-1}, d_0, \dots, d_{k-1}$. Since one of $c_0, \dots, c_{k-1}, d_0, \dots, d_{k-1}$ may be assumed to be 1, we see $\mathbf{x}$ lies in a variety of dimension at most $2k-1$, and so any linear subspace containing only $\mathbf{x}$ of this form must have dimension at most $2k-1$. □

Lemma 10.2. *We have*

$$\#\{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbb{F}_p^n : \wedge(\mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{0}\} \ll p^{2k-2}.$$

Proof. If $\wedge(\mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbf{F}_p^n$, then there are constants $c_0, \dots, c_{k-1}$ one of which is 1 such that $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} c_i T_i(\mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{0}$. We argue in the case $c_{k-1} = 1$; the other cases are analogous. Looking at the ℓ^{th} component for $\ell \le n-k+1$, we see this gives $b_{n-k+2-\ell}$ in terms of $b_{n-k+1-\ell}, \dots, b_n$. In particular, $\mathbf{b}$ is uniquely determined by $b_{n-k+2}, \dots, b_n$ and $c_1, \dots, c_{k-2}$. Hence there are at most p^{2k-2} choices of $\mathbf{b}$. □

Since we have a bound $2k-1$ in Lemma 10.1 instead of k of Lemma 8.2, we can only insure that $\Lambda_{\mathbf{v}}$ has a basis satisfying the first and third conditions of Lemma 8.3 with $\wedge(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_{2k}) \neq 0$ instead of $\wedge(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_{k+1}) \neq 0$. This requires a number of small modifications throughout Section 9 with each instance of $\mathbf{z}_{k+1}$ replaced by $\mathbf{z}_{2k}$ (and some corresponding minor adjustments replacing $k+1$ with $2k$). This affects the argument when we establish (9.5), since instead we have

$$Z_1^{2k} Z_{2k}^{n-3k} \ll \det(\Lambda_{\mathbf{v}}) \ll V^k \ll (BC)^{k^2/(n-2k)},$$

and so to deduce that $Z_1 Z_{2k} \ll (BC)^{1-2\delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$ we require that $n > (2+\sqrt{2})k$. Similarly, for Lemma 9.6, to ensure that $Z_1 Z_{2k} \ll B^{2-2\delta}$ using $Z_1^{2k} Z_{2k}^{n-3k} \ll \det(\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}) \ll A^k$ we require that $A^{k/(1-\delta)} \ll B^{2n-6k}$ as well as $A^{k/(1-\delta)} \ll B^{n-k}$. The rest of the Archimedean estimates go through as before.

For the non-Archimedean estimates, we use the bound of Lemma 10.2 instead of Lemma 9.9 in Lemma 9.10. In order to conclude that for $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2 \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}$ we have $\wedge(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2) = \mathbf{0} \pmod p$ only if at least two non-zero polynomials with no common factor vanish $\pmod p$, we require that $n-k \ge 2k-2+k+2$ instead of $n-k \ge k-1+k+2$; i.e. we require $n \ge 4k$. With this restriction, the rest of the proof of the Type II estimate goes through as before.

Combining the above restrictions, we see that we have the Type II estimate provided $n \ge 4k$ and any polytope $\mathcal{R} \subseteq [\epsilon^2, n]^\ell$ has

$$(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\ell) \in \mathcal{R} \Rightarrow \max\Big(k+\epsilon, \frac{kn+\epsilon}{2n-5k}\Big) < \sum_{j=1}^{\ell_1} \xi_j < n-2k-\epsilon$$

for some $\ell_1 \le \ell$ (in addition to the assumptions already contained in Proposition 5.1). For $n < 5k$ this has reduced the range of our Type II estimate, and so we require a slightly different decomposition of $S(\mathcal{A}, \mathfrak{z}_2)$.

When $n \ge 4k$, we see we can handle Type II terms if there is a factor with norm in the interval $[X^{n/3+\epsilon}, X^{n/2-\epsilon}]$. An identical argument then shows that we have an equivalent of Proposition 5.2 for sums $\sum_{\mathfrak{d}} S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}}, \mathfrak{z}_1')$ instead of $\sum_{\mathfrak{d}} S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{d}}, \mathfrak{z}_1)$, where $\mathfrak{z}_1'$ is any ideal with $N(\mathfrak{z}_1') < X^{n/6-2\epsilon}$ (since this is the length $X^{n/2-\epsilon}/X^{n/3+\epsilon}$ of our new Type II range). We let $\mathfrak{z}_1', \mathfrak{z}_2', \mathfrak{z}_3', \mathfrak{z}_4'$ be chosen maximally (with respect to the ordering of ideals from Section 5) subject to $N(\mathfrak{z}_1') < X^{n/6-2\epsilon}$, $N(\mathfrak{z}_2') < X^{n/3+\epsilon}$, $N(\mathfrak{z}_3') < X^{n/2-\epsilon}$, $N(\mathfrak{z}_4') < X^{n/2+\epsilon}$. By applying Buchstab's identity twice, and

splitting up some of the summations which appear we have

$$\begin{aligned}
S(\mathcal{A},\mathfrak{z}_3') &= S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}},\mathfrak{z}_1') - \sum_{\mathfrak{z}_1'<\mathfrak{p}\le\mathfrak{z}_4'} S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}},\mathfrak{p}) \\
&= S(\mathcal{A},\mathfrak{z}_1') - \sum_{\mathfrak{z}_1'<\mathfrak{p}_1\le\mathfrak{z}_2'} S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}_1},\mathfrak{z}_1') - \sum_{\mathfrak{z}_2'<\mathfrak{p}\le\mathfrak{z}_3'} S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}},\mathfrak{p}) - \sum_{\mathfrak{z}_3'<\mathfrak{p}\le\mathfrak{z}_4'} S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}},\mathfrak{p}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\mathfrak{z}_1'<\mathfrak{p}_2\le\mathfrak{p}_1\le\mathfrak{z}_2'} S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}_1\mathfrak{p}_2},\mathfrak{p}_2) \\
&= S(\mathcal{A},\mathfrak{z}_1') - \sum_{\mathfrak{z}_1'<\mathfrak{p}_1\le\mathfrak{z}_2'} S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}_1},\mathfrak{z}_1') - \sum_{\mathfrak{z}_2'<\mathfrak{p}\le\mathfrak{z}_3'} S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}},\mathfrak{p}) - \sum_{\mathfrak{z}_3'<\mathfrak{p}\le\mathfrak{z}_4'} S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}},\mathfrak{p}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{z}_1'<\mathfrak{p}_2\le\mathfrak{p}_1\le\mathfrak{z}_2' \\ \mathfrak{p}_1\mathfrak{p}_2>\mathfrak{z}_2'}} S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}_1\mathfrak{p}_2},\mathfrak{p}_2) + \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{z}_1'<\mathfrak{p}_2\le\mathfrak{p}_1\le\mathfrak{z}_2' \\ (\mathfrak{z}_1')^2<\mathfrak{p}_1\mathfrak{p}_2\le\mathfrak{z}_2'}} S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}_1\mathfrak{p}_2},\mathfrak{p}_2).
\end{aligned}$$

The first three and the fifth terms in the decomposition above can be evaluated asymptotically by the equivalents of Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 5.2. The fourth and the final terms can be bounded in magnitude by replacing $S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}},\mathfrak{p})$ and $S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}_1\mathfrak{p}_2},\mathfrak{p}_2)$ with $S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}},\mathfrak{z}_1)$ and $S(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}_1\mathfrak{p}_2},\mathfrak{z}_1)$ respectively, and the equivalent of Proposition 5.2 then shows that these terms contribute $O(\epsilon)$ to the final estimate since the range of norms in the sums is of length $O(\epsilon)$ in the logarithmic scale. Thus we have a decomposition where all terms can be evaluated asymptotically or contribute a negligible amount.

The final minor change is in the proof of Lemma 5.3. In establishing (6.5), we used the multiplicative structure of $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt[n]{\theta}]$. However, recalling that $(\mathbf{a}\diamond\mathbf{b})_n = \mathbf{a}\cdot T_0(\mathbf{b})$ and $T_0(\mathbf{b})_\ell$ is equal to $b_{n+1-\ell}$ plus some linear combination of $b_{n-\ell+2},\dots,b_n$, we see that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{a}\in[1,q]^n \\ a_j=0 \text{ if } j>n-k}} e(\mathbf{a}\cdot T_0(\mathbf{b})/q) = \begin{cases} q^{n-k}, & \text{if } b_n=\cdots=b_{k+1}=0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus the proof goes through exactly as before.

References

[1] B. J. Birch. Forms in many variables. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Ser. A*, 265:245–263, 1961/1962.

[2] J. W. S. Cassels. *An introduction to the geometry of numbers*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997. Corrected reprint of the 1971 edition.

[3] H. Davenport. On a principle of Lipschitz. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 26:179–183, 1951.

[4] W. Duke. Some problems in multidimensional analytic number theory. *Acta Arith.*, 52(3):203–228, 1989.

[5] J. Friedlander and H. Iwaniec. Asymptotic sieve for primes. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 148(3):1041–1065, 1998.

[6] J. Friedlander and H. Iwaniec. The polynomial X^2+Y^4 captures its primes. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 148(3):945–1040, 1998.

[7] A. Fröhlich and M. J. Taylor. *Algebraic number theory*, volume 27 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.

[8] H. Halberstam and H.E. Richert. *Sieve methods*. L.M.S. monographs. Academic Press, 1974.

[9] G. Harman. On the distribution of αp modulo one. II. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 72(2):241–260, 1996.

[10] G. Harman. *Prime-detecting sieves*, volume 33 of *London Mathematical Society Monographs Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2007.
[11] D. R. Heath-Brown. Diophantine approximation with square-free numbers. *Math. Z.*, 187(3):335–344, 1984.
[12] D. R. Heath-Brown. Primes represented by $x^3 + 2y^3$. *Acta Math.*, 186(1):1–84, 2001.
[13] D. R. Heath-Brown and B. Z. Moroz. Primes represented by binary cubic forms. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 84(2):257–288, 2002.
[14] D. R. Heath-Brown and B. Z. Moroz. On the representation of primes by cubic polynomials in two variables. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 88(2):289–312, 2004.
[15] H. Iwaniec. Primes represented by quadratic polynomials in two variables. *Acta Arith.*, 24:435–459, 1973/74. Collection of articles dedicated to Carl Ludwig Siegel on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday, V.
[16] J. Neukirch. *Algebraic number theory*, volume 322 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999. Translated from the 1992 German original and with a note by Norbert Schappacher, With a foreword by G. Harder.
[17] A. Weiss. The least prime ideal. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 338:56–94, 1983.

Magdalen College, Oxford, England, OX1 4AU

E-mail address: james.alexander.maynard@gmail.com